
SHAKESPEARE AND KING HENRY V:

Historical Research Informing Artistic Decisions

A Thesis Submitted to the
College of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of Master of Arts
Interdisciplinary Studies
University of Saskatchewan
Saskatoon

BY
SKYE BRANDON

PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Postgraduate degree from the University of Saskatchewan, I agree that the Libraries of this University may make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for copying of this thesis in any manner, in whole or in part, for scholarly purposes may be granted by the professor or professors who supervised my thesis work or, in their absence, by the Head of the Department or the Dean of the College in which my thesis work was done. It is understood that any copying or publication or use of this thesis or parts thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the University of Saskatchewan in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my thesis.

DISCLAIMER

The Greystone Theatre production of *Henry V* was exclusively created to meet the thesis requirements for the degree of Master of Arts at the University of Saskatchewan. Reference in this thesis to any specific commercial products, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the University of Saskatchewan. The views and opinions of the author expressed herein do not state or reflect those of the University of Saskatchewan, and shall not be used for advertising or product endorsement purposes.

Requests for permission to copy or to make other uses of materials in this thesis in whole or part should be addressed to:

Chair
Interdisciplinary Studies
College of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
University of Saskatchewan
116 Thorvaldson Building, 110 Science Place
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, S7N 5C9 Canada

OR

Dean
College of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
University of Saskatchewan
116 Thorvaldson Building, 110 Science Place
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, S7N 5C9 Canada

ABSTRACT

William Shakespeare (1564-1616) remains simultaneously the most produced and most studied playwright in the English-speaking world. With so many Shakespeare festivals spread across Canada and the United States, it seems that there would be ample opportunity for the artistic and academic communities to partner with each other. However, in my experience, very few scholars practice as professional theatre artists, and conversely there are very few theatre artists that have taken the time that many academics have done in studying and researching Shakespeare's plays. My thesis asks: *Would productions of Shakespeare's plays be better served by bringing together artistic and academic methodologies?*

Using one of Shakespeare's great history plays as the "subject," I have spent the duration of my graduate studies researching Henry V (1386-1422) and the medieval period in which he lived, and I have studied and read scholarly materials that cover his life as well as the literature that would have been available to Shakespeare when he wrote his play *Henry V* (1599). All this was done as the preparation for a production of *Henry V* that integrated specific research that was discovered by utilizing methodologies from the three departments that make up my Interdisciplinary studies (Drama, English, and History) along with the creative insights that I brought from my own professional experience as a working theatre artist since the completion of my undergraduate studies.

The Greystone Theatre production of *Henry V* had its theatrical run in the Emrys Jones Theatre on the U of S campus from November 22 to December 1, 2018.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I have a great deal of gratitude for my committee: co-advisors Dr. Moira Day and Dr. Joanne Rochester, committee chair Dr. Doug Thorpe, and committee members Dr. Sharon Wright, Dr. Frank Klaassen, and Pamela Haig Bartley. I have received guidance from them all at one point in time or another, and some were instrumental in creating special topics courses to facilitate my degree. Additional thanks to Dr. Jim Clifford from the U of S History Department, and Dr. Brent Nelson from English. Designers Carla Orosz and Beverley Kobelsky not only provided fantastic designs for the production but were key collaborators from beginning to end.

My study was supported by two Interdisciplinary Studies Devolved Scholarships, as well as a SHRCC Joseph Armand Bombardier Canada Graduate Scholarship (Master's). Without this financial support I would not have been able to continue my work.

Thanks also goes to Kendall Bitner, Kyle Dase, Mark Doerksen, Tristan Taylor, Joel Salt, Shane Farris, and Chloe Peters for their Latin translation of the missing section of the *Gesta Henrici Quinti*; James Dobson, Devin Backman, and the Interdisciplinary Studies team; Nora Polley and the staff of the Stratford Festival Archives Department; the U of S Drama Department and Greystone Theatre who supported my work and treated me as a colleague; and the entire cast and crew of *Henry V*, without whose work and dedication this whole project would have been for naught. Finally, thank you to my wife, Kristi, and my daughter, Pyper, for their support on this journey.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PERMISSION TO USE	i
DISCLAIMER	i
ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
HISTORY CHAPTER: “A Historical view of King Henry V”	4
A Brief Overview of King Henry V	4
Early Sources	6
Latin Lives.....	7
Chronicles.....	12
King Henry’s Personal Writing	13
Holinshed, Hall, and the newly discovered North	15
Holinshed	15
Hall	16
North.....	18
Survey of Historical Scholarship	19
Thoughts on King Henry V following the Historical Survey	26
Conclusion	30
ENGLISH CHAPTER: “King Henry V in Elizabethan Literature”	32
Literary Criticism on Shakespeare’s History Plays	32
Granville-Barker to Tillyard and Campbell’s Elizabethan Worldview	33
The Lost Garden.....	35
New Historicism and Cultural Materialism.....	36
Holderness, Rackin, and Recent Perspectives	39
Shakespeare’s Prince Hal (<i>1 and 2 Henry IV</i>)	43
Shakespeare’s King Henry (<i>Henry V</i>).....	47
The Threat Before Harfleur	47
The Order to Kill the French Prisoners	51
Final Thoughts on the Three Films	54
Conclusion	56
ASSESSMENT CHAPTER	59
Audience Feedback.....	62

Results	63
Acting Company Feedback.....	67
Results	68
Final Thoughts	73
APPENDICES	79
Appendix A: An Overview of the History Play as a genre	79
Appendix B: Henry in <i>The Famous Victories</i> , <i>Sir John Oldcastle</i> , and <i>The Shoemaker's Holiday</i>	85
<i>HENRY V</i>	91
Part One	93
Part Two	128
BIBLIOGRAPHY	166

INTRODUCTION

Over the course of my near nineteen-year career as a professional actor and theatre director, and one whose focus is classical texts, I have found in my experience a disconnect between the artistic communities that produce Shakespeare professionally, and the academic communities that research his life and work as scholars. I am often frustrated that our current rehearsal models do not incorporate more research. The idea for my graduate studies was born out of that frustration in hopes of finding a possible alternative.

William Shakespeare (1564-1616) remains simultaneously the most produced and most studied playwright in the English-speaking world. His plays are so frequently staged in the United States that *American Theatre* magazine has stopped including him altogether in their “most-produced” lists.¹ With so many Shakespeare festivals spread across Canada and the United States, it seems that there would be ample opportunity for the artistic and academic communities to partner with each other. However, in my experience, very few scholars practice as professional theatre artists, and conversely there are very few theatre artists that have taken the time that many academics have done in studying and researching Shakespeare’s plays. My thesis asks: *Would productions of Shakespeare’s plays be better served by bringing together artistic and academic methodologies?*

Using one of Shakespeare’s great history plays as the “subject,” I have spent the duration of my graduate studies researching Henry V (1386-1422) and the medieval period in which he lived, and I have studied and read scholarly materials that cover his life as well as the literature that would have been available to Shakespeare when he wrote his play *Henry V* (1599). All this

¹ Diep Tran, “The Top 10 Most-Produced Plays of the 2015–16 Season,” *American Theatre* 32, no. 8 (October 2015): 40-1.

was done as the preparation for a production of *Henry V* that integrated specific research that was discovered by utilizing methodologies from the three departments that make up my Interdisciplinary studies (Drama, English, and History) along with the creative insights that I brought from my own professional experience as a working theatre artist since the completion of my undergraduate studies.² I will highlight what I have discovered throughout my studies and will identify how the research process informed my artistic decisions, while also encouraging dialogue between both academic and artistic communities.

I have divided my thesis into five components. The first is a survey chapter titled “A Historical view of King Henry V,” which was written while drawing upon the research done during my Special Topics course with Professor Sharon Wright, *Reinventing Late Medieval England: Henry V, Power, Patronage, and the Crown*. The second component is a chapter titled “King Henry V in Elizabethan Literature.” This is based on the literary review and text analysis that I completed in Professor Joanne Rochester’s Special Topics course *Henry V: Literature and Sources*, as well as my Special Topics course *Henry V in Production*, created by Professors Moira Day and Pamela Haig Bartley.

The third section is an edited production script of William Shakespeare’s *Henry V*. The research done during my course work with Professors Day and Haig Bartley was instrumental in making editorial decisions, as well as discovering dramaturgical elements to utilize in a production of the play. The fourth component is the production of *Henry V* itself, which enjoyed its run as part of Greystone Theatre’s 2018/19 season in the John Mitchell Building on the University of Saskatchewan campus from November 21 until December 1, 2018.

² As a professional actor and director, I have worked on over thirty Shakespeare productions covering dozens of his plays, primarily through the Stratford Festival, Shakespeare on the Saskatchewan, and the YXE Shakespeare Lab.

The final component is an assessment chapter where I reflect not only on the production of *Henry V*, but also the rehearsal process that was created in putting together the presentation. It works not only as a post-mortem for this particular process, including feedback from both the audience and the acting company, but it also sets the stage for future historical/theatrical projects in addition to solidifying a personal methodology moving forward.

HISTORY CHAPTER: “A Historical view of King Henry V”

A Brief Overview of King Henry V

Henry was born at Monmouth Castle in August or September of either 1386 or 1387. We know for certain that Henry’s parents were at Monmouth in the summer of 1386, which leads some scholars, including Christopher Allmand, to conclude that Henry was likely born in that year.³ However, there are those who believe that 1387 is the year in which he was born. The fact that it was not clearly recorded, and that we do not know for certain, actually highlights an important fact: there would not have been a great need to record his birthdate since, at the time of his birth, Henry was not expected to become King of England.

Henry’s father was crowned Henry IV in 1399 following the deposition of Richard II, who was Henry IV’s cousin and Prince Henry’s uncle. Shortly after his deposition, Richard died at Pontefract Castle in Yorkshire. The exact cause of death is not known, but the most likely scenarios are that Richard was either starved to death or killed, either by command of Henry IV or by someone who supported Henry IV. While there is little doubt that Richard, who had no heir, helped bring about his own downfall by banishing and disinheriting his cousin Henry, many in England were not satisfied that Henry Bolingbroke became King Henry IV through the deposition of Richard. Distrust, suspicion, and rebellion hung over much of Henry IV’s reign and his son now found himself thrust into the world of national governance as the new Prince of Wales. Henry IV was king of England from October 1399 until his death in March of 1413, which gave Prince Henry nearly fourteen years of apprenticeship as heir to the throne. By the time Prince Henry was

³ Christopher Allmand, *Henry V* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: The University of California Press, 1992), 7.

crowned king at the approximate age of twenty-seven, he was “young in years but old in experience,”⁴ having spent half of his life preparing to be the monarch of England.

What do we know about Henry, the person? He was seen as being above average height, had brown hair (although he is sometimes represented as having red hair in some portraits), and according to a Frenchman in 1415, cited by Allmand, Henry looked “more like a priest than a soldier.”⁵ That being said, Henry was no stranger to battle. In fact, at the Battle of Shrewsbury against the rebels in 1403, Henry was struck in the face with an arrow, a wound that he was fortunate to survive and one which would have left the young prince scarred for the rest of his life.⁶ Even though he was “hurt in the face with an arrow” during the battle, according to Rafael Holinshed, Henry refused to leave the field for fear it would discourage his soldiers, a story from the battle that very likely had been passed down over the years since it also appears in Thomas Walsingham’s chronicle.⁷

Henry V is most widely known for his success at the battle of Agincourt (October 1415), the siege of Harfleur (which preceded Agincourt throughout August and September of the same year), as well as the Treaty of Troyes which was officially signed in May of 1420. The fact that all three incidents took place on French soil should come as no surprise: Henry’s attempt to claim the lands that he saw as lawfully his own through his direct descent from King Edward III,⁸ resulted

⁴ Frank Taylor and John Roskell, ed. and trans., *Gesta Henrici Quinti: The Deeds of Henry the Fifth* (London: Oxford University Press, 1975), 3.

⁵ Allmand, *Henry V*, 61.

⁶ Juliet Barker, *Agincourt* (New York: Back Bay Books, 2005), 31.

Malcolm Vale, *Henry V: The Conscience of a King* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2016), xiii.

⁷ Raphael Holinshed, *Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland. Vol. 3.* (London: Printed for J. Johnson, 1807-08), 26.; David Scott Kastan, ed., *King Henry IV Part 1* (London: The Arden Shakespeare, 2002), 324; David Preest and J.G. Clark, ed. and trans., *The Chronica Maiora of Thomas Walsingham* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2005), 328.

⁸ Edward III, Henry’s great-grandfather, had claimed the French crown through his mother, Isabella of France, daughter of King Philip IV.

in Henry spending most of his reign in France rather than his native England. I find it also worth noting that all three of these historical events are depicted in Shakespeare's *Henry V*. Perhaps their dramatization has contributed to their ongoing popularity over the years at the expense of other events that occurred during Henry's reign.

Henry married the French princess Katherine Valois in June 1420 (a condition of the Treaty of Troyes) and they eventually had one son who was born in December 1421, shortly before Henry's sudden death (apparently from dysentery) in August of 1422. Henry had returned to France in order to deal with those who were not honouring the Treaty of Troyes, and since Katherine was still expecting their child when he departed from England he never did meet his son, who would then become King Henry VI at the age of nine months. Henry's father-in-law, Charles VI of France, died only two months later leaving the infant Henry VI also King of France, according to the Treaty of Troyes. It was a disputed claim, to be sure, which eventually led to the events dramatized in Shakespeare's previously written trilogy, *Henry VI* Parts 1, 2, and 3. Although written prior to *Henry V*, this set of plays (along with *Richard III*) take place chronologically later, covering Henry VI's reign and the Wars of the Roses.

Early Sources

In preparing for and planning the production of *Henry V*, I wanted to know what materials existed before Shakespeare wrote his play. Did these sources explain why Shakespeare presented Henry in the way he did? Would that information help interpret the play and give insight into the character of King Henry?

Many of those who frequently read the plays of William Shakespeare will know that it is widely believed Shakespeare drew upon the chronicles of Raphael Holinshed (1529-1580) and

Edward Hall (1497-1547) as the source material for a number of his plays, specifically those that make up Shakespeare's "History" plays. Despite how important those sources are (more on that below), the chronicles of Hall and Holinshed most certainly were based on sources that existed prior to their own chronicles, whether those were copied from older manuscripts, published materials, or stories and anecdotes orally passed down over the years. So, when looking at Shakespeare's History plays, and *Henry V* in particular, some questions arise: What sources exist from the time of, or shortly thereafter, the reign of King Henry V? And how reliable are those sources? The following section of this chapter highlights some of the sources available during and shortly after King Henry's lifetime, and have been separated into three sections: specific Latin life accounts of Henry V, recorded chronicles that include Henry's reign, and the materials that we can trace back to Henry himself, including his government correspondence and the wills he composed before leaving on campaign for France.

Latin Lives

The source that puts us closest to Henry, and within the siege of Harfleur and battle of Agincourt themselves, is the anonymous *Gesta Henrici Quinti* (*The Deeds of Henry V*). Given its perspective I have given more space to the *Gesta* than the sources that follow. Covering events that span from Henry's accession on April 9 1413⁹ until November 20 1416,¹⁰ the *Gesta* gives a first-person account of the Lollard uprising,¹¹ the 1415 campaign through France, an extremely detailed account of Henry's return to London in November of that same year, as well as referencing the meeting between King Henry, the Emperor Sigismund of Luxembourg, and the Duke of

⁹ Taylor and Roskell, *Gesta*, 3.

¹⁰ Taylor and Roskell, *Gesta*, 179.

¹¹ Lollardy was a precursor to Protestantism, initially led by John Wycliffe, and was at odds with the Roman Catholic Church during the early part of Henry's reign. In January of 1414, John Oldcastle led a revolt whose aim was to overthrow King Henry. The revolt was suppressed at the battle on St. Giles' Fields.

Burgundy, John the Fearless. The *Gesta* concludes with Henry's half-uncle Thomas Beaufort being appointed as the first Duke of Exeter, with plans for an English return to France clearly in progress.¹²

Since the *Gesta* is an anonymous manuscript, it has garnered quite a bit of interest as to who the author could be. Given its content and perspective, the author is believed to be "an Englishman in priest's orders attached to the court."¹³ In the introduction to their 1975 translation of the *Gesta*, Frank Taylor and John Roskell list some of the candidates that have been suggested over the years,¹⁴ namely Jean de Bordin, Thomas Elmham (in part because of his own *Liber Metricus*; more below), Thomas Rodbourne, Edmund Lacy, and John Stevens. All of these are names that Alison K. McHardy also mentions in her chapter of the recent publication *Henry V: New Interpretations*, titled "Religion, Court Culture, and Propaganda: The Chapel Royal in the Reign of Henry V."¹⁵ However, Taylor and Roskell listed reasons as to why they thought none of these candidates could be accepted and ultimately concluded "that the chaplain who wrote the *Gesta* remains unidentified."¹⁶ The name "royal chaplain" is one that appears frequently when reading through historical material that investigates the life accounts of Henry V. Taylor and Roskell use it when referring to the anonymous author,¹⁷ and McHardy draws our attention to the use of "royal chaplain" by citing Taylor and Roskell in her own writing.¹⁸ Keith Dockray also uses

¹² Taylor and Roskell, *Gesta*, 181.

¹³ Taylor and Roskell, *Gesta*, xviii.

Taylor and Roskell refer to three specific sections of the *Gesta*, p. 28, 84, and 88.

¹⁴ Taylor and Roskell, *Gesta*, xix – xxiii.

¹⁵ Alison K. McHardy, "Religion, Court Culture, and Propaganda: The Chapel Royal in the Reign of Henry V," in *Henry V: New Interpretations*, ed. Gwilym Dodd (Woodbridge: York Medieval Press, 2013), 142.

¹⁶ Taylor and Roskell, *Gesta*, xxiii.

¹⁷ Taylor and Roskell, *Gesta*, xviii.

¹⁸ McHardy, "Religion, Court Culture, and Propaganda," 142.

“royal chaplain” in his book *Henry V*,¹⁹ and then continually refers to the author simply as the chaplain throughout the rest of his chapter “Fifteenth-Century English Perspectives.”²⁰

The fact that the *Gesta Henrici Quinti* abruptly stops near the end of 1416, with much of Henry’s reign still to come, may provide a clue to the author’s identity. In *New Interpretations*, McHardy makes a compelling case for Stephen Patrington, who was Henry’s personal confessor.²¹ Patrington was a Carmelite friar who not only would have had access to Henry and the court, but who also passed away in December 1417, a year following the conclusion of the *Gesta* narrative. Taylor and Roskell, along with Dockray, all suggest that the *Gesta* was composed from late 1416 in to the spring or summer of 1417,²² while McHardy surmises that completion would have to have been done by November 1417.²³ McHardy herself states that “no definitive answer to the problem of authorship is yet possible,”²⁴ but Christopher Allmand, who also contributed to *New Interpretations*, points out in the book’s introduction that McHardy’s proposal is “at the very least, one which merits serious attention” and “[if] nothing else, it is a challenge to another scholar to do better.”²⁵

In addition to the *Gesta Henrici Quinti*, there are other fascinating lives of Henry V that merit our attention. Two other Latin lives include Thomas Elmham’s *Liber Metricus de Henrico Quinto* (*Metrical Life of Henry V*) which was referenced above, and Tito Livio’s *Vita Henrici Quinti* (*Life of Henry V*). Elmham stated himself that *Liber* was a shorter work in verse based on

¹⁹ Keith Dockray, *Henry V* (Stroud: Tempus, 2004), 14.

²⁰ Dockray, *Henry V*, 13-32.

²¹ McHardy, “Religion, Court Culture, and Propaganda,” 131-156.

²² Taylor and Roskell, *Gesta*, xviii.; Dockray, *Henry V*, 14.

²³ McHardy, “Religion, Court Culture, and Propaganda,” 147.

²⁴ McHardy, “Religion, Court Culture, and Propaganda,” 153.

²⁵ Christopher Allmand, *Henry V: New Interpretations*, ed. Gwilym Dodd (Woodbridge: York Medieval Press, 2013), 6.

a longer work of prose which he had previously written, but was now lost.²⁶ Since Elmham references this earlier work as the basis for the *Liber* some suspected that perhaps he was referring to the *Gesta*, which in turn became the basis of Elmham's possible authorship. As Dockray states, "very rarely does Elmham provide information not to be found elsewhere" but adds "the *Liber* is riddled with mistakes and misunderstandings."²⁷ In the introduction to their translation of the *Gesta*, Taylor and Roskell suggest "Elmham was more a compiler and arranger of the materials of others, however interesting and useful those materials might be."²⁸ The most interesting element that comes from looking at the *Liber*, as Dockray points out, is that Elmham is the first writer to relate the tennis ball incident; a story, in which the Dauphin of France sends King Henry a gift of tennis balls in order to mock him,²⁹ that finds its way into a memorable scene early in Shakespeare's *Henry V*. So, if Thomas Elmham does not give us a great deal more than we can find elsewhere, then how does Tito Livio help paint the picture of Henry V?

In regards to Tito Livio's *Vita Henrici Quinti*, there is one major issue that has to be addressed: Livio wrote his *Vita* during the second half of the 1430s, well over a decade after King Henry V died in August 1422. Livio would have had no personal knowledge of Henry, having originally been from Italy and not having arrived in England until the mid-1430s. However, Livio "had become 'poet and orator' to"³⁰ Humphrey Duke of Gloucester, Henry's youngest brother, and appears to have been commissioned by Humphrey to write a Latin life of Henry V.³¹ Given that Livio was under the patronage of the Duke of Gloucester, the perspective of the *Vita* should

²⁶ Dockray, *Henry V*, 16.

Dockray has used Elmham's *Liber* in *Memorials of Henry V*, ed. C.A. Cole (1858).

²⁷ Dockray, *Henry V*, 17.

²⁸ Taylor and Roskell, *Gesta*, xxi.

²⁹ Dockray, *Henry V*, 17.

³⁰ Dockray, *Henry V*, 18.

³¹ Dockray, *Henry V*, 18.

be regarded cautiously since it is quite certain that Gloucester would want the life account of his oldest brother to be a positive one. The greatest addition that the *Vita Henrici Quinti* does provide is its inclusion of the latter years of Henry's reign. With the *Gesta* concluding at the end of 1416, the *Vita Henrici Quinti* "is the fullest authority we have and, for the period 1418-1422 (not covered by the *Liber Metricus* either), it is the earliest life."³² Dockray also draws attention to Livio's writing style and how he would consistently put speeches into the mouth of Henry.³³ It could very well be that some of the speeches that appear in Shakespeare's play may have had their seed planted in some of Livio's prose.

There is also, in fact, another Latin life on the topic of Henry V, one that has come to be known by scholars as the Pseudo-Elmham. The *Vita et Gesta Henrici Quinti*, another anonymous telling of Henry's life and deeds, surfaced during the fifteenth century, and in 1727 the eighteenth-century antiquarian Thomas Hearne incorrectly ascribed the work to Thomas Elmham.³⁴ As a result of that mistake, the moniker Pseudo-Elmham was created and it has now become a way to quickly reference the anonymous *Vita et Gesta Henrici Quinti*. There is some differing opinion as to when the Pseudo-Elmham was written. For example, Dockray states that it made its appearance within ten years of Tito Livio's *Vita* and that Livio's work provided the model for the Pseudo-Elmham.³⁵ However, in Gwilym Dodd's contribution to *Henry V: New Interpretations*, a chapter titled "Henry V's Establishment," Dodd argues that the Pseudo-Elmham "is now thought to have been written slightly earlier than Livio's work in the mid-1430s."³⁶ Whether it was Livio who built

³² Dockray, *Henry V*, 19.

Dockray has used Livio's *Vita Henrici Quinti*, ed. T. Hearne (1716).

³³ Dockray, *Henry V*, 19.

³⁴ Taylor and Roskell, *Gesta*, xvi.

³⁵ Dockray, *Henry V*, 20.

³⁶ Gwilym Dodd, "Henry V's Establishment," in *Henry V: New Interpretations*, ed. Gwilym Dodd (Woodbridge: York Medieval Press, 2013), 37.

upon the Pseudo-Elmham, or whether it was the opposite, what the Pseudo-Elmham does provide is content beyond 1420, an area in which the other “Lives” are lacking.³⁷ Dockray suggests that the Pseudo-Elmham was instigated at the request of Walter Lord Hungerford,³⁸ a steward of Henry V. If this is true, then we are presented with a similar problem as with Livio’s *Vita*: a document that was requested to be written by someone close to the king. Therefore, one has to remind themselves that these accounts are almost certainly going to portray Henry in a largely positive light.

Chronicles

Beyond the life accounts of Henry, we can also turn our attention to chroniclers including Thomas Walsingham, Adam Usk, and John Stecche, as well as later additions to the *Brut*. The main difference between the Latin lives and the chroniclers listed above is that the perspective of the chroniclers goes beyond the specific life of Henry V. Walsingham for example covers European history, from the English point of view, starting at the very end of Edward III’s reign (1327-1377) until the funeral of Henry V,³⁹ since Walsingham himself is believed to have died in 1422. It should be pointed out that all of these sources are from the English perspective. There are many French chronicles which also recount the events of Henry’s reign, which certainly makes sense since not only was Henry at war with France, but as stated earlier he also physically spent more of his reign on the continent than he did in his home country. A number of French commentators are quoted and analyzed in Keith Dockray’s chapter “Fifteenth-Century French Verdicts,”⁴⁰ including Jean Waurin, Georges Chastellain, Enguerrand de Monstrelet, and the

³⁷ Dockray, *Henry V*, 20.

³⁸ Dockray, *Henry V*, 20.

³⁹ Preest and Clark, *The Chronica Maiora of Thomas Walsingham*, 447.

⁴⁰ Dockray, *Henry V*, 33-43.

anonymous monk of Saint-Denis. The French view is an important perspective to have when considering Henry V as an historical figure, since French commentators, as Dockray points out, “had little reason to pen favourable verdicts on a king who won a spectacular victory in the field at Agincourt, conquered much of north-western France and, but for his untimely death in 1422, seemed destined to succeed to the Valois throne.”⁴¹ And yet there are multiple instances when Henry is viewed positively by the French, including the monk of Saint-Denis who stated “No prince in his time appeared more capable to subdue and conquer a country, by the wisdom of his government, by his prudence and by the other qualities with which he was endowed,” despite the monk quickly qualifying that statement with “although the dissensions and discords which reigned among the French princes had powerfully assisted him in realising his projects of conquest.”⁴² Whether any of these opinions had any great effect on how Henry was perceived in England I do not know, but it is worth noting that he was not only respected within his own country but by opposing forces as well.

King Henry’s Personal Writing

Malcolm Vale’s 2016 book, *Henry V: The Conscience of a King*, is a well-timed scholarly work in regards to this research given that his book is exclusively focused on primary sources. Vale does not set out to make a case for Henry as a great king, nor does he attempt to vilify Henry simply as a war-monger. In the acknowledgements at the beginning of his book, Vale says that his goal was “to attempt a study of Henry V drawing largely upon the archival evidence (which is reasonably extensive) for his own personal involvement and intervention in matters both public and private.”⁴³ What also stood out, was Vale’s comment, “(w)hile the accounts, views and

⁴¹ Dockray, *Henry V*, 33.

⁴² Dockray, *Henry V*, 35.

⁴³ Vale, *Henry V*, ix.

opinions of chroniclers, annalists, moralists and others can never be completely ignored, their testimony can often tell us as much about them as about their subject.”⁴⁴ The approach is a good reminder that even though there is no personal diary by Henry that we can turn to in order to understand his most personal thoughts and concerns, we do have a good amount of documentation written in his own hand that we can reference, not to mention his actions, and make our own decisions based on how we interpret what we find. That way, the reader is not trying to decide if they agree or not with the author’s portrayal of Henry, but are instead encouraged to survey the evidence.

While the entire book is of assistance, the chapters that are of the greatest interest are “‘In mine own hand’: the Personalisation of Kingship,”⁴⁵ “The King and the English Language,”⁴⁶ and “Last Will and Legacy.”⁴⁷ Vale points out the personal involvement of Henry in addressing grievances, and concludes that Henry was “in many ways a model, exemplar and yardstick for what was to follow. If nothing else, his conception and exercise of governance were regarded ... as a gold standard, however unattainable, by which other, later regimes, might be judged.”⁴⁸ Vale also highlights how Henry expressed the personalisation of his kingship by introducing the English language into government documents, where the “style and format of the king’s signet letters, memoranda and diplomatic instructions in effect created a new genre of English governmental and administrative documentation.”⁴⁹

⁴⁴ Vale, *Henry V*, viii.

⁴⁵ Vale, *Henry V*, 62-87.

⁴⁶ Vale, *Henry V*, 88-125.

⁴⁷ Vale, *Henry V*, 240-59.

⁴⁸ Vale, *Henry V*, 87.

⁴⁹ Vale, *Henry V*, 121.

The final chapter of Vale's book is insightful for obvious reasons. It is focused on the wills that Henry wrote in July 1415, July 1417, June 1421, and the codicils that he added days before his death. There is not a more personal expression than the wishes of an individual who knows that they are facing their end. And the fact that Henry drafted multiple wills (each time before he sailed for France), means that not only does one have the opportunity to view Henry's wishes and intentions, but one can also observe "the evidence they offer of changes in those intentions over his short lifetime."⁵⁰

And while many other scholars give attention to a great deal of the material Malcolm Vale covers in his book, none of them focus solely on the primary sources that are linked to Henry V in an attempt to seek out "evidence for the direct action and engagement of its human subject wherever it can be found."⁵¹ This alone makes Vale's book a very special secondary source.

Holinshed, Hall, and the newly discovered North

Holinshed

Of all sources Shakespeare relied upon for his History plays, Holinshed's *Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland* draws the most attention, in part because the second edition was published in 1587, about the time when William Shakespeare would have been making his way to London (if he had not already done so), and the chronicle would presumably have been the most readily available source for Shakespeare to have in his possession or at his disposal. Holinshed's *Chronicles* not only supplied Shakespeare with material to draw upon for his English History

⁵⁰ Vale, *Henry V*, 242.

⁵¹ Vale, *Henry V*, 279.

plays, but he also relied on Holinshed for inspiration for *Macbeth* and *King Lear*, as well as *Cymbeline*.

In 1927, Allardyce and Josephine Nicoll first published their book *Holinshed's Chronicle: As Used in Shakespeare's Plays*, which collects the specific sections of Holinshed's work that directly corresponds to Shakespeare's plays. The Nicoll book also clearly noted which section of Holinshed's Chronicle the passage is being drawn from, so it is very easy to track when Shakespeare has placed events out of sequence or when he leaps over multiple sections all together. And while the 1927 study allows a reader to see the sections that Shakespeare used, as well as compare how much he drew upon for each individual play (quite a bit for *Richard II*, much less for the *Henry IV* plays, and very little for *King Lear*), it does not allow a reader to reference the sections that Shakespeare *did not* use, which can be just as revealing.

It is also worth remembering that Holinshed did not simply write about these historical events from memory. He had his own sources that he drew upon, and some are mentioned within the text of the chronicles themselves. In the Henry IV section of his chronicle, following the battle of Shrewsbury, Holinshed refers to both Thomas Walsingham and the French chronicler Euguerant de Monstrellet when reporting the numbers of the French sent to support Owen Glendower.⁵² Not only does this clearly show that Holinshed was referencing sources from within and without England, but it also shows that his sources did not always agree on the specifics of those events.

Hall

Edward Hall's chronicle was published in 1548, twenty-nine years earlier than Holinshed's first edition in 1577, and one year following his own death in 1547. The full title of Hall's chronicle

⁵² Allardyce and Josephine Nicoll, ed., *Holinshed's Chronicle: As Used in Shakespeare's Plays* (London: J.M. Dent and Sons, 1927), 62.

was *The Union of the Two Noble and Illustre Families of Lancastre and Yorke*. The title itself is a good indication as to why it has great importance. While Holinshed's *Chronicles* is a vast sweeping work that covers centuries of English, Scottish, and Irish history over six volumes, Hall's work on the other hand begins with the ascension of Henry IV to the English throne in 1399 and is focused specifically on the struggle between the two Plantagenet family lines of Lancaster and York (a struggle that resulted in what we now refer to as the Wars of the Roses), followed by the unification of those two families with the reign of Henry VII and his son Henry VIII. However, it should not be thought that Hall wrote a small treatise on the civil strife between these two families. His chronicle may only be one volume, but it is a lengthy and detailed publication broken into sections based on the reigns of each English king from Henry IV to Henry VIII, with each section separated into narratives of each year for every monarch's tenure as king.

Since Hall passed away before his work had been published, it fell to Richard Grafton to print and release the chronicle. In Grafton's note to the reader, he states that Hall had finished up to "the foure and twentie yere of kyng Henry the eight" (Henry VIII reigned for thirty-eight years), and that he completed Hall's work based solely on Hall's notes and that Grafton himself finished the chronicle "vtterly without any addicion of myne."⁵³ Hall's chronicle is dedicated to King Edward VI,⁵⁴ which is also worth noting. Hall died the same year as Henry VIII, 1547, and one does not have to look beyond the title given to the section on Henry VIII, "The Triumphant Reigne of Kyng Henry the VIII," to know that Hall had a very positive view of that particular Henry. In fact, almost 42% of the chronicle is spent on Henry VIII. And while some of that volume can be explained by Henry VIII's long reign as king, the proportion is still large if one considers that Hall

⁵³ Edward Hall, *Hall's Chronicle* (New York: AMS Press Inc., 1965), vii.

⁵⁴ Hall, *Hall's Chronicle*, v.

only spent forty-five pages to cover the reign of Henry IV, which lasted fourteen years. All of this to point out that Hall had a likely bias when it came to Henry VIII (the chronicle was released when his son Edward had taken the throne), so it should come as no surprise that it paints a very positive picture of Henry VIII. As a final point to Hall's admiration for Henry VIII, once Mary ascended to the throne following Edward VI's death, she had Hall's chronicle banned.⁵⁵

Similarly, Hall, like Holinshed, used multiple sources himself in piecing together his chronicle. One may turn to the early pages of the chronicle to see just how many sources Hall had relied upon. Hall (or perhaps Grafton, since the inventory follows the note to the Reader) lists sixteen Latin authors, twelve French authors, and eight English writers, in addition to noting that many anonymous pamphlets were also drawn upon.⁵⁶ And it should not be overlooked, that since Hall's chronicle was published in 1548, he was very likely a source for Holinshed as well.

North

In a very recent discovery, there now appears to have been another source that Shakespeare used for many of his plays. In their 2018 book, '*A Brief Discourse of Rebellion and Rebels*' by George North: A Newly Uncovered Manuscript Source for Shakespeare's Plays, Dennis McCarthy and Dr. June Schlueter report how they used plagiarism software in order to make a case for George North's recently discovered manuscript (written in 1576) as a very likely source for multiple Shakespeare plays. Of interest to this research, some of the plays include *Richard III*, *2 Henry VI*, *3 Henry VI*, and *Henry V*.

Shakespeare appears to have relied on *A Brief Discourse* more for the content and form of specific monologues than for plot or story elements. By their calculation, McCarthy and Schlueter

⁵⁵ Edward Hall, *The Union of the two noble families of Lancaster and York, 1550* (Menston: Scolar Press, 1970), i.

⁵⁶ Hall, *Hall's Chronicle*, viii.

claim that “more than twenty Shakespearean monologues and passages” could be traced back to North’s essay.⁵⁷ Specifically in regards to *Henry V*, the play relies upon the manuscript primarily in passages spoken by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Duke of Exeter during the play’s second scene. It is the Archbishop’s analogy to bees that draws such a direct link to North’s *A Brief Discourse*,⁵⁸ and based on McCarthy and Schlueter’s research it does seem extremely probable that Shakespeare used the manuscript as a source. Their book, of course, begs the question, ‘how did Shakespeare have access to this manuscript?’; this is a question that is not answered in this book but will apparently be addressed in their next book. However, it will have to be a theory that relies on a narrative wherein the manuscript would have had to have remained in the North library at Kirtling Hall during Shakespeare’s lifetime since the essay was not in circulation.⁵⁹

What makes this probable source such a unique find, is that it reaches across many years of Shakespeare’s career and affects so many of his various plays (as early as the *Henry VI* plays, and as late as *Coriolanus*), and yet was never published.

Survey of Historical Scholarship

There is no shortage of secondary sources for the life of Henry V, the historical figure. With the 600th anniversary of the Battle of Agincourt taking place in 2015 there was a flurry of new publications leading up to, and shortly after, that. By reviewing the scholarship on Henry

⁵⁷ Dennis McCarthy and June Schlueter, ‘*A Brief Discourse of Rebellion and Rebels*’ by George North: A Newly Uncovered Manuscript Source for Shakespeare’s Plays (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2018), 1.

⁵⁸ McCarthy and Schlueter, *A Brief Discourse*, 22-7.

⁵⁹ McCarthy and Schlueter, *A Brief Discourse*, 88.

since the turn of the twentieth century, I hoped to discover if there was any consensus in how he is perceived today. And if not, is there any consistency in those opinions?

Christopher Allmand has been researching and writing about Henry (among other members of the English monarchy) since the 1960s, and his 1992 book, *Henry V*, is still considered a biography that anyone studying Henry should read, and has in fact been cited in every book that I have read about Henry V that has been released following Allmand's publication. Not only does the book adopt a comprehensive biographical approach by covering events as they happened chronologically, but the second half of Allmand's book goes into great detail on specific areas of Henry's life: the composition of his army and navy, his financial affairs, involvement in Parliament, and other details of his reign. Allmand is not necessarily interested in trying to prove that Henry was the greatest king that England had every seen; nor is he trying to paint Henry in a negative light. Allmand's book is one in a series dedicated to English monarchs, so as he states in his introduction, his goal is to answer the question "what was Henry's status as a monarch?"⁶⁰ This approach results in the author attempting to interpret what he has found, rather than attempting to sway the reader to take a particular stance. I dare say that this approach is a great reason why Allmand's book is still cited and referenced as often as it is. In the end, Allmand found Henry "much more complex a figure than may at first appear," and through his careful consideration of the king, concluded that Henry "emerges as a ruler whose already high reputation is not only maintained but enhanced."⁶¹

Keith Dockray's 2004 book, also titled *Henry V*, has proven to be a valuable resource as well and has a structure somewhat similar to Allmand's. Whereas Allmand dedicates the first half

⁶⁰ Allmand, *Henry V*, 3.

⁶¹ Allmand, *Henry V*, 443.

of his book to the “biography” of Henry, Dockray does so in the second part of his own book. In Dockray’s first section he has chapters dedicated not only to the English perspective of Henry, which as expected is quite positive, but also the French (which has been very beneficial), and additional chapters including “Tudor Judgements,” and “William Shakespeare’s Henry V.” Dockray ultimately leaves his readers with a balanced presentation of King Henry. He concludes that “(m)ost of the time, the king was honest and upright in his dealings; he was decisive in planning, and effective in delivering, policy,” but that there is also evidence “of altogether less admirable traits in Henry V’s character and behaviour.”⁶² Dockray also suggests that Henry “probably was fortunate to die suddenly before his reputation became irrevocably tarnished.”⁶³

Anne Curry has emerged as a prolific resource not only on Henry but specifically the Battle of Agincourt. Her books are many, including: *The Battle of Agincourt: Sources and Interpretations* (2000); *Agincourt: A New History* (2005); *Henry V: Playboy Prince to Warrior King* (2015). Curry has also edited and contributed to multiple-authored books, including: *Agincourt 1415* (2000); *Henry V: New Interpretations* (2013); and *The Battle of Agincourt* (2015), which was co-edited with Malcolm Mercer. Curry’s detailed accounts of Agincourt deliver tremendous insight into the battle itself as well as the preparations that were made in planning the campaign, and she suggests that “(t)he impact of Agincourt on a man who had already survived one battle in 1403 despite a serious injury from an arrow, and who had been transformed upon taking up the mantle of kingship, is not to be dismissed as medieval ‘spin’. Henry now truly believed he was God’s anointed.”⁶⁴ And although other scholars have pointed out that Curry’s work is a “balanced assessment” of

⁶² Dockray, *Henry V*, 214.

⁶³ Dockray, *Henry V*, 242.

⁶⁴ Ann Curry, *Agincourt: A New History* (Stroud: Tempus, 2005), 251.

Henry V,⁶⁵ I personally found her 2015 book, *Henry V: Playboy Prince to Warrior King*, far from balanced and portrayed Henry as a young man hungry to become king.

Juliet Barker and Ian Mortimer could both be categorized more as populist than academic writers, but that is not to say that their books should be ignored. Barker specializes in literary biographies but has also contributed a great deal to the study of medieval English tournaments. The two books of Barker's that are most helpful to this research are *Agincourt: Henry V and the Battle that made England* (2005), and *Conquest: The English Kingdom of France* (2009). Mortimer, who despite making his career as a writer does hold multiple degrees including a BA in history and a MA in archive studies, has written multiple biographies on the topic of medieval political leaders including *The Fears of Henry IV* (2007), and *1415: Henry V's Year of Glory* (2009). Generally speaking, Barker has a more neutral opinion of Henry (especially concerning the events of Agincourt), whereas Mortimer's opinion is far from positive, as other scholars such as Keith Dockray and Malcolm Vale often cite, as will be shown below.⁶⁶

Malcolm Vale is a now retired professor from the University of Oxford, who researches Anglo-French history during the later Middle Ages. Some of his books include *The Origins of the Hundred Years War* (1996), and *The Ancient Enemy: England, France and Europe from the Angevins to the Tudors* (2007). As shown by these two titles alone, Vale has a helpful overview of the Hundred Years' War (1337-1453) that allows him to speak with detail about both sides of the conflict. His latest book, *Henry V: The Conscience of a King* (2016), has been a fantastic resource for this research. Not only is it a survey of a specific time period within the greater Hundred Years' War, but it is a book constructed by reviewing primary sources as they relate specifically to Henry

⁶⁵ Vale, *Henry V*, 278.

⁶⁶ See note 78.

V, namely surviving letters and Henry's will. Vale never proclaims any kind of personal opinion about Henry V, but instead weighs the pitfalls of trying to do so. Vale states, "(a)ttempts to analyse the behaviour of medieval rulers exclusively in terms of 'success' and 'failure' of sincerity and hypocrisy, or of 'good' and 'bad' kingship, though often entertaining, are not always helpful," and highlights the point that "the historian, sometimes quite unwittingly, can sit in self-appointed judgement of 'the great ones live in the world's eye.'"⁶⁷

Additional historians who have contributed interpretations and offered opinions about Henry V earlier in and throughout the twentieth century include: C.L. Kingsford (whose 1901 *Henry V: The Typical Medieval Hero*, was the first full-length scholarly biography on Henry V),⁶⁸ J.H. Wylie, W.T. Waugh, R.B. Mowat, E.F. Jacob, K.B. McFarlane, Harold F. Hutchison, Margaret Wade Labarge, G.L. Harriss, Edward Powell, Desmond Seward, and T.B. Pugh. Of these, the scholars that merit closer attention are Wylie and Waugh, given their connection despite vastly different opinions of Henry, as well as McFarlane and Harriss.

Between 1914 and 1929 a three-volume history about Henry V, titled *The Reign of Henry the Fifth*, was published. J.H. Wylie wrote Volume 1 and most of Volume 2 before he passed away in 1914, covering events up to 1416. W.T. Waugh then used Wylie's notes and early drafts to complete Volume 2, which included events up to 1420. Waugh then finished the writing on his own with the publication of Volume 3 in 1929, spanning the final years of Henry's reign, 1420 to 1422.⁶⁹ Wylie had already written a four-volume epic about Henry IV (*History of England under Henry the Fourth*) in the late nineteenth century, and was well on his way to writing a tome of equal size about Henry V. Keith Dockray states in his own book that Wylie "was immensely

⁶⁷ Vale, *Henry V*, 278.

⁶⁸ Dockray, *Henry V*, 62.

⁶⁹ Dockray, *Henry V*, 67.

knowledgeable but also rambling, obsessively addicted to minute detail ... and lacking in discrimination when handling the vast amount of source material he so avidly accumulated.”⁷⁰ In his 1915 review of Volume 1, C.L. Kingsford said “both text and notes tend to be more burdened with minute details and discursions, until it is difficult to follow the real course of the narrative.”⁷¹ One of the interesting details regarding Waugh taking over from Wylie, apart from Wylie’s attention to specifics, is that they appear to have had differing opinions about Henry V. According to Dockray, Wylie found Henry “driven by ambition to deceit and untruthfulness and owing his success in France in 1415 more to good fortune than anything else,”⁷² whereas Waugh is quoted in Dockray’s book as saying that Henry was “indisputably the greatest Englishman of his day.”⁷³ Two individuals can certainly come to a different conclusion about any given topic or person, but why this stands out as compelling is that Wylie died in late February of 1914, five months before the beginning of World War I, and Waugh published Volume 2 of *The Reign of Henry the Fifth* in November of 1918 when the war was coming to an end. Not only does the shift in worldview between the beginning and end of World War I mark the difference of opinion between these two scholars, but it is also the beginning of a decades long run of positive interpretations regarding Henry V, no doubt aided by Laurence Olivier’s 1944 film that was released near the end of World War II. It is not until the 1960s when scholars like E.F. Jacob and Harold F. Hutchison begin to critique Henry in a balanced fashion, one that is more familiar to what we see in recent years.⁷⁴ Jacob, whose work focused on Henry’s invasion of France, attributed many characteristics to

⁷⁰ Dockray, *Henry V*, 67.

⁷¹ C.L. Kingsford, “Reviews of Books,” *The English Historical Review* 30, no. 117 (January 1915): 138-140.

⁷² Dockray, *Henry V*, 67.

⁷³ Dockray, *Henry V*, 68.

⁷⁴ Dockray, *Henry V*, 69-70.

Henry; “Powerful, magnetic and subtle,” he labelled Henry a “master” of propaganda, and finally “ruthless” as well.⁷⁵

K.B. McFarlane is a former fellow of Magdalen College at the University of Oxford, who died in 1966. He did not publish a great deal during his lifetime, and it is due to the work of his former student G.L. Harriss that we have some of his scholarship in printed form. The book by McFarlane’s that is of the most relevance to this research is *Lancastrian Kings and Lollard Knights*, released six years after McFarlane’s death in 1972. One section of the book is titled “Henry V: a Personal Portrait” and is referenced in many of the books about Henry V that followed, specifically those written by Allmand, Dockray, and Vale. A quotation of McFarlane’s that has come up on multiple occasions, and seems to have raised a few eyebrows, was made in 1954. McFarlane concluded in one of his lectures that Henry was “the greatest man that ever ruled England.”⁷⁶ While Dockray brings up the quotation within a larger section about the varying opinions of Henry V over many years, Ian Mortimer uses the quotation in his book *1415: Henry V’s Year of Glory*⁷⁷ to construct himself a strawman where, in the opinion of Malcolm Vale, Mortimer “sets out substantially to revise our assessment of Henry V and does not shrink from controversy.”⁷⁸ I am sure that Mortimer’s negative opinion of Henry is based on multiple reasons, but is it all that surprising that such a strong opinion is stated at a time that follows both the Vietnam War and the invasion of Afghanistan, when governments and world leaders were often being criticized for military action?

⁷⁵ E.F. Jacob, *Henry V and the Invasion of France* (London: The English Universities Press, 1947), 188-9.

⁷⁶ Dockray, *Henry V*, 69.

⁷⁷ Vale, *Henry V*, 12.

⁷⁸ Vale, *Henry V*, 12.

There will never be a consensus of opinion declaring Henry as “the greatest man that ever ruled England,” as this brief section on scholarship can attest. But what can be agreed upon, is that Henry V left behind a legacy that would have been difficult for anyone to follow.

Thoughts on King Henry V following the Historical Survey

As stated earlier, the three events that most frequently come to mind when discussing Henry’s reign are Harfleur, Agincourt, and Troyes. However, while these are events of great importance, they are only three specific events within a reign that lasted almost ten years. There are many other political maneuvers and sieges that helped establish the kind of king that Henry was, and those experiences must not be brushed aside. As Henry continued through his reign, and in the years following his death, two traits became synonymous with the King. The first was that Henry was an accomplished military strategist; the second was that following his coronation Henry became a deeply religious man,⁷⁹ a piousness that continued until his death. Although Shakespeare’s plays present a very different kind of Henry as prince, his play, *Henry V*, can easily reflect both of these traits in Henry as king. But what other relationships and experiences shaped the course of his life?

Henry not only personally fought against the multiple rebellions that crept up in the early years of his father’s reign, but he eventually became a member of his father’s council and served in Parliament for most of his father’s remaining years between 1406 and 1413, even leading the council in 1410 and 1411.⁸⁰ These years were no doubt beneficial in forming the diplomatic skills

⁷⁹ Dodd, *Henry V: New Interpretations*, 37.

⁸⁰ Dockray, *Henry V*, 87.

that Henry utilized once he became king himself. During the later years of his father's reign Henry created strong relationships with his half-uncles Henry and Thomas Beaufort, relationships that he would be able to trust and rely upon once he became king himself. Henry would also come to rely on his three younger brothers; Thomas (Duke of Clarence), John (Duke of Bedford), and Humphrey (Duke of Gloucester). And while it appears that friction existed between Henry and Thomas (the eldest of his younger siblings) during the last few years of their father's life, Henry came to utilize Thomas just as he did his other younger siblings during his own reign.⁸¹ Henry's ability to surround himself with people who were loyal to him should not be overlooked.

The battle at Agincourt is the pinnacle of Henry V's story. It is the climax of Shakespeare's play, and historically speaking it is the event for which he is most remembered even today. However, Henry and his countrymen were very fortunate to have survived their 1415 excursion into France. In the end, Henry made the most of the situation in which he found himself and overcame great odds at Agincourt, but he went against the council of everyone else in his camp when he made the decision to march from Harfleur to Calais,⁸² and in retrospect he should not have put his men in that position at all. Ultimately, what Agincourt did for Henry was supply him with something to rally his country behind, while giving him the ammunition he needed to convince English leaders to support his ongoing campaigns. Additionally, and possibly most important, it convinced many, and reiterated for Henry, that God was on their side.

Henry returned to France in 1417 and launched his second campaign which lasted until 1420, ultimately bringing about the aforementioned Treaty of Troyes. From a dramaturgical point of view, it makes sense that Shakespeare would leave the events of those years out of his play,

⁸¹ Allmand, *Henry V*, 333-48.

⁸² Taylor and Roskell, *Gesta*, 61.

since there was not any particular siege or battle that happened during that time that had the same impact on events as did the battle at Agincourt. Yet, what ends up being sacrificed for the benefit of a more economic narrative are many of the great details, including the relationship between Henry and the Duke of Burgundy, John the Fearless, that help support my theory that it is Henry's second campaign into France where he validated himself as a military strategist. The in-fighting that existed among the French nobility at that time was a huge factor in Henry's success in France.⁸³ The Burgundians did not become involved while Henry made his landing at Harfleur in 1415, and also did not take part in the battle of Agincourt itself, as John the Fearless "was an ambitious man whose policy and public conduct were dictated more by a desire to achieve control of the reins and sources of French power, which might be used to further the wealth and status of his own duchy, than by almost anything else."⁸⁴ What England and Burgundy specifically said or promised to each other when they negotiated in the spring of 1414, we almost certainly will never know (it should be noted that England was also negotiating with the Armagnacs at the same time).⁸⁵ But what is clear, is that both Henry and John the Fearless recognized that they were in a position to benefit from each other.

Strangely enough, John's greatest assistance to Henry may have been peace negotiations with his fellow Frenchmen. In September 1419, the Duke of Burgundy met with the Dauphin⁸⁶ at Montereau to come to terms in order to find a way to stop Henry's progress through Normandy.⁸⁷

⁸³ The Armagnac/Burgundian conflict was a civil dispute between two branches of the French royal family spanning the years of 1407 to 1435. The two factions were the house of Orleans (Armagnac) and the house of Burgundy (Burgundian). Both families were related to King Charles VI, but neither were first in line of succession.

⁸⁴ Allmand, *Henry V*, 70.

⁸⁵ Dockray, *Henry V*, 136.

⁸⁶ This Dauphin was not the one portrayed in Shakespeare's *Henry V*. When Louis the Dauphin died shortly after the Battle of Agincourt in December of 1415, his younger brother John became Dauphin but died in 1417, which then made Charles the next Dauphin. He eventually became King of France, and is portrayed in Shakespeare's first part of *Henry VI*.

⁸⁷ Allmand, *Henry V*, 133-35.

At that meeting John the Fearless was assassinated. At first, one might think with John out of the way that the Dauphin would have been able to take control of the differing factions and unite the French, but that was not the case. The assassination of John the Fearless “resulted in a comprehensive metamorphosis of the political and diplomatic situation in France.”⁸⁸ Whether he officially gave the command himself or not, the Dauphin was now viewed in a very negative light among many French citizens. Multiple pieces were now at play that were to Henry’s advantage: Charles VI still had frequent bouts of madness, the Dauphin had gained nothing but suspicion and distrust with the assassination of John the Fearless, and John’s son Philip had no real experience to overcome the Armagnacs by himself and yet had hoped to avenge the death of his father. Henry was in a position to step into the power vacuum that existed and possibly take control of France himself. If there was ever a time when Henry thought that he could actually claim territories beyond Normandy and Aquitaine, this would have been it. In the months that followed, Henry was able to take advantage of the disorder among the French nobility and finally bring about the Treaty of Troyes.

So, Henry did not simply land in France, defeat the French army at Agincourt, and then sign a treaty to secure the eventual joining of the English and French crowns, as some may interpret the story arc of Shakespeare’s play. There was a great deal more that took place over a number of years. While Henry certainly deserved the reputation that he gained as a strong military leader, what should not be ignored is his keen eye for making the right agreement at the right time and taking advantage of situations as they presented themselves. The king had taken a misstep in leading his men from Harfleur to Calais in the fall of 1415. It was an error that almost cost him his life and the lives of many others, but an error that he appears to have learned from, since he never

⁸⁸ Dockray, *Henry V*, 186.

made a similar mistake again. Perhaps he learned a hard lesson during his attempted march through northern France. Preparation, timing, and good fortune would all prove to be just as important to King Henry V's success as his skill in warfare had been.

Conclusion

After reviewing the historical research on Henry V, what may be concluded about the historical figure before further considering Shakespeare's play? The two pillars on which Henry's reputation stands, his religious piety and his military expertise as a soldier, certainly hold firm. However, he was so much more than those two characteristics. Henry was efficient when it came to governance and managed to diligently right the ship of England's finances.⁸⁹ He engaged under the chivalric code when in battle and laying siege, giving his enemies countless opportunities to surrender or recant before taking action. Henry successfully straddled both the secular and ecclesiastical worlds,⁹⁰ and he delegated various responsibilities to his trusted inner circle very wisely⁹¹ while being generous to those that were loyal to him. Nonetheless, if he was crossed or disobeyed, Henry was also harsh and unwavering in his justice, sometimes to the point where he was considered cruel.⁹² A defining trait of Henry was his patience. With the exception of leading his ever-dwindling numbers across France after the siege of Harfleur, Henry was always prepared to make the next political or military move but did not act until it made sense to do so.

⁸⁹ Dodd, *Henry V: New Interpretations*, 11-33.

⁹⁰ Allmand, *Henry V*, p. 287.

⁹¹ Allmand, *Henry V*, pp. 333-48.

⁹² Dockray, *Henry V*, p. 36.

By the time of his death, Henry had successfully quelled the Lollard uprising,⁹³ dealt with the Southampton plot that sought to overthrow or kill him,⁹⁴ aided in bringing an end to the Great Schism within the Catholic church which lasted from 1378 until 1417,⁹⁵ brought Normandy under English control, and negotiated of a treaty which left him regent and heir of France and united both the French and English crowns for his heirs. Henry's years as king were not perfect, but he is rightfully seen as more than a soldier who "applied his mind with all devotion to encompass what could promote the honour of God."⁹⁶ To use Allmand's words, Henry was a monarch who spent most of his years as king at war, and used that war "to help harness the country and, not least, the nobility behind him in an effort to bring unity to the kingdom."⁹⁷ As shown above, his achievements as a king go beyond his military exploits; by the time of Henry's death, England was a much more important country within the international context of Europe. We are left only to theorize what Henry ultimately could have achieved had he lived longer.

⁹³ See note 11.

⁹⁴ The Southampton plot was the planned assassination of King Henry and members of his inner-circle before they set sail for France in 1415, with the intention of placing Edmund Mortimer on the throne. It is depicted in Shakespeare's *Henry V*, and resulted in the capture and execution of Richard Earl of Cambridge, Henry Lord Scroop of Masham, and Sir Thomas Grey.

⁹⁵ The Great Schism was a split within the Catholic Church where two, and for a time three, men all claimed to be the pope. It was tied much more to politics than differences in theology, and ended at the Council of Constance in 1418.

⁹⁶ Taylor and Roskell, *Gesta*, 3.

⁹⁷ Allmand, *Henry V*, 1.

ENGLISH CHAPTER: “King Henry V in Elizabethan Literature”

This chapter reflects on various literary views of Shakespeare’s History plays and how those critical perspectives have changed over the years. It also investigates key moments in Shakespeare’s portrayal of Henry V and how editing and changing the text for performance can affect the interpretation of the character, and the play as a whole, from one production to another.

Literary Criticism on Shakespeare’s History Plays

There is a great deal of theory and criticism applied to Shakespeare’s works in general, and his History plays specifically. There is no shortage of opinions and points of view that have been shared over the past one hundred years, and it is no easy task to wade through them all. To find a starting point I referred to both the Arden and Oxford editions of *Henry V* to collect some of the more frequently cited scholars, and used those scholars to trace back and find individuals that they themselves made reference to. For the purposes of this study I have surveyed a wide range of work from Harley Granville-Barker and J. Dover Wilson, to E.M.W. Tillyard and Lily Campbell; from John Wilders to Stephen Greenblatt, Alan Sinfield, and Jonathon Dollimore; from Graham Holderness and Phyllis Rackin to Ronald Knowles and Isabel Karremann. The names above are only a few, but they are the ones that I have gravitated towards while working on this thesis. That is not to say that I will not be referencing and citing the work of others in the following pages, but the scholars mentioned above mark noteworthy shifts in how *Henry V* has been perceived.

Similar to that of the survey on historical literature of the previous chapter, an intriguing pattern emerges within the literary criticism as well. The opinions of both the play and the character of Henry change over the twentieth, and into the twenty-first century, and can be linked to external events.

Granville-Barker to Tillyard and Campbell's Elizabethan World View

First, I would like to draw attention to Granville-Barker's essay/lecture, "From Henry V to Hamlet", because it sets the stage for Tillyard. In this piece, first presented as a lecture in 1925, and then published in *Aspects of Shakespeare* (1933), Granville-Barker declares his disappointment in *Henry V* as a play, and he additionally states that he believes Shakespeare himself was disappointed in the play.⁹⁸ Granville-Barker's theory is that, following *Henry V*, *Julius Caesar* marks a turn-around for the playwright with the character of Brutus, and that Brutus, as an improvement in characterization over King Henry, then leads to Shakespeare's writing of Hamlet. It is an opinion shared by Tillyard and is in fact the final comment Tillyard makes in his chapter on *Henry V*, citing Granville-Barker.⁹⁹

E.M.W. Tillyard's 1944 monograph, *Shakespeare's History Plays*, incorporating Lily Campbell's theories of Elizabethan views of history,¹⁰⁰ proposes that Elizabethan England believed and adhered to a strict belief system, one where every person and thing fell under a 'chain of being' or 'world order', and at the top of that chain was the monarchy. One of the sources Tillyard refers to in his book is the *Book of Homilies of the English Church*; he continually proposes that the citizens of England at that time would all know the Homilies, and therefore Shakespeare would be reflecting these beliefs in his plays. Tillyard states "(t)he picture we get from Shakespeare's Histories is that of disorder,"¹⁰¹ and the cycle of plays starting with *Richard II*, and ending with *Richard III*, show England paying for the crime of Henry Bolingbroke's usurpation of Richard II. The proper chain of order has been disrupted with the removal of God's

⁹⁸ Harley Granville-Barker, "From Henry V to Hamlet." *More Prefaces to Shakespeare* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974), 143.

⁹⁹ E.M.W. Tillyard, *Shakespeare's History Plays* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1944), 314.

¹⁰⁰ Tillyard, *Shakespeare's History Plays*, vii.

¹⁰¹ Tillyard, *Shakespeare's History Plays*, 7.

chosen monarch, and the plays recreate the events up until the Battle of Bosworth Field where Henry Tudor kills Richard III and unifies the two houses of Lancaster and York with Henry's marriage to young Elizabeth, Edward IV's daughter. R.J.C. Watt suggests that Tillyard proposed that Shakespeare's History plays "present disorder as an abhorrent departure from a natural state of order,"¹⁰² and that the England of the past was lacking the order which Shakespeare's England was enjoying at the time under Elizabeth I, making the plays "an embodiment of the 'Tudor myth.'"¹⁰³ Tillyard sees Edward Hall as the greatest influence of Shakespeare's sources, and as a result suggests that the theme throughout Hall's chronicles is that of Shakespeare's as well: the theory that only through the Tudors, with the union of Lancaster and York, can the disorder be dealt with. The major problem with Tillyard's theory is that it suggests that the Elizabethan worldview he proposes is the *only* view that existed at the time. Given the material that Tillyard presents, no one would disagree that there would have been a desire for order, especially from the church. But what Tillyard does not seem to consider, is that since there is such a persistence on achieving order then it must follow that there was most likely some sort of disorder that was present at Shakespeare's time, or, at the very least, a resistance to the *type* of order that was being proposed. Given that Tillyard would have been writing his book during the second World War, a time when global order was lacking, he also stands as an example of how our own political and world views can potentially affect the lens through which we are viewing a particular subject.

Lily Campbell's book was published three years later in 1947, and its full title is of some importance: *Shakespeare's "Histories": Mirrors of Elizabethan Policy*. As Campbell's title suggests, she proposes that Shakespeare's plays serve as a political mirror in which Elizabethan

¹⁰² R.J.C. Watt, ed., *Shakespeare's History Plays* (London and New York: Longman, 2002), 2.

¹⁰³ Watt, *Shakespeare's History Plays*, 2.

England is reflected back. She also presents a very fascinating perspective on what History writing would have been during the Renaissance and its links to classical writers like Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian, stating that “history is a phase of rhetoric,”¹⁰⁴ and that ancient orators and rhetoricians “influenced the concept of history as a form of creative writing, opposed to the idea of history as a set of records.”¹⁰⁵ Campbell presents a specific contemporary reason for Shakespeare to write each of his History plays, although she does not discuss *Henry VIII* in her book. If one is to consider Tillyard and Campbell together, and completely agree with their theories, then a person would have no choice but to believe that Edward Hall was certainly a Tudor apologist, and that Shakespeare was of the same opinion as Hall. However, we know that Shakespeare used multiple sources for his plays, and most scholars at this point believe the *Chronicles* of Raphael Holinshed were far more influential on Shakespeare than Edward Hall. Robert Ornstein is one such example of those scholars.¹⁰⁶ Ornstein additionally makes a strong case that Hall was not the Tudor myth-supporting chronicler that Tillyard proposes, and even states, “Hall was familiar with this moralistic interpretation of the past and refers to it in his Chronicle, but he never acknowledges it as his own.”¹⁰⁷

The Lost Garden

Following the monolithic opinion of Tillyard, a new humanist view emerged which is best exemplified in John Wilders’ *The Lost Garden* (1978). Wilders says himself that he believes Tillyard “seriously misinterpreted the plays and oversimplified the opinions of the chroniclers,”¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁴ Lily B. Campbell, *Shakespeare’s “Histories”: Mirrors of Elizabethan Policy* (San Marino: Huntington Library, 1947), 26.

¹⁰⁵ Campbell, *Shakespeare’s “Histories,”* 27.

¹⁰⁶ Robert Ornstein, “The Artist as Historian” in *Shakespeare’s History Plays: Richard II to Henry V* ed. Graham Holderness (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1992), 35-49.

¹⁰⁷ Ornstein, “The Artist as Historian,” 42.

¹⁰⁸ John Wilders, *The Lost Garden: A View of Shakespeare’s English and Roman History Plays* (Totowa: Rowman and Littlefield, 1978), x.

and that one of his (Wilders') purposes in writing his book at that time was to show connections between Shakespeare's English and Roman plays, and that Shakespeare's English History plays should be looked at within the context of all his works.¹⁰⁹ Wilders concentrated on moral dilemmas and personal tragedies within the larger national context of the plays, with 'man' as his focus and outside of a predestined plan of punishment created by God, and as a result he serves as an example of the transition out of Tillyard's long shadow.

In the foreword to his book, Wilders states that, whether he is portraying the Greeks or Trojans, the Romans or the English nobility, Shakespeare's imagination is "governed by a view of human nature which he held irrespective of the historical period he chose to depict," and that "Shakespeare's view of human nature shaped his view of history."¹¹⁰ While theorists that followed Wilders have also moved away from the notion that Shakespeare was presenting a God-imposed plan upon nations of people, they have rejected many of Wilders' other conclusions.

New Historicism and Cultural Materialism

With the 1980s came the introduction of New Historicism, seen primarily as an American theory, along with its British cousin, Cultural Materialism. The most important New Historian linked to Shakespeare's History plays is Stephen Greenblatt, specifically through his essay "Invisible Bullets." The essay appeared in the 1985 collection, *Political Shakespeare*, and again in an expanded form within Greenblatt's own book, *Shakespearean Negotiations*, which was published in 1988. Greenblatt uses the *Henry IV* and *V* plays to draw attention to authority, and the subversion by that authority, during the Renaissance. Louis A. Montrose wrote in his book, *The Purpose of Playing*, that the terms 'subversion' and 'containment' are used to refer to the

¹⁰⁹ Wilders, *The Lost Garden*, x.

¹¹⁰ Wilders, *The Lost Garden*, ix.

“capacity of the dominant order to generate subversion so as to use it to its own ends.”¹¹¹ Greenblatt finds that since Shakespeare wrote during a time when the theatres could be subject to State censorship, his drama can also be “relentlessly subversive,”¹¹² although his point is “less that (Shakespeare) *represented* the paradoxical practices of an authority deeply complicit in undermining its own legitimacy than he *appropriated* for the theatre the compelling energies at once released and organized by these practices.”¹¹³ Influenced by Michel Foucault, New Historicism explores subjugation and repression, and has a reoccurring element where subversion is contained and any dissent that may exist is already being suppressed. The theory, in its relation to Shakespeare, seems to suggest that the plays cannot be separated from the context in which they were written, and so Shakespeare’s plays become a method of understanding, as best as one can, culture at the time of the Renaissance. This is similar to what Tillyard is trying to achieve with his Elizabethan worldview approach, although New Historicists are coming to a different conclusion: one of subversion, and not unity under a Tudor monarchy. Critics of New Historicism have pointed out that this creates a predictable pattern in its operation, and that it is itself a monolithic approach, which ironically is what New Historicists had accused Tillyard of having previously done himself with his own approach. Watt, when discussing the weaknesses of New Historicism, states that the theory has “a formulaic argument which leads predictably to the same conclusion about subversion and containment.”¹¹⁴ Additionally, Montrose points out that the terms ‘subversion’ and ‘containment’ could be “residues of a Cold War ideology that had pernicious consequences in both

¹¹¹ Louis A. Montrose, *The Purpose of Playing: Shakespeare and the Cultural Politics of the Elizabethan Theatre* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), 8.

¹¹² Stephen Greenblatt, “Invisible bullets,” in *Political Shakespeare* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985), 45.

¹¹³ Stephen Greenblatt, *Shakespearean Negotiations* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), 40.

¹¹⁴ Watt, *Shakespeare’s History Plays*, 10.

international and domestic policy,”¹¹⁵ providing another example of how one’s approach to criticism can be shaped by one’s current environment.

Cultural Materialism, influenced by Marxism, also deals with power and ideology, but unlike New Historicism, it takes social change into consideration. In his introduction to *Shakespeare’s History Plays*, editor, Graham Holderness, presents a very detailed comparison of the two theories and their differences as they relate to Shakespeare. The section is worth quoting in its entirety.

Cultural materialism is much more concerned to engage with contemporary cultural practice, where New Historicism confines its focus of attention to the past; cultural materialism can be overtly, even stridently polemical about its political implications, where New Historicism tends to efface them. Cultural materialism partly derives its theory and method from the kind of cultural criticism exemplified by Raymond Williams, and through that inheritance stretches its roots into the British tradition of Marxist cultural analysis, and thence into the wider movement for socialist education and emancipation; New Historicism has no sense of a corresponding political legacy, and takes its intellectual bearings directly from ‘poststructuralist’ theoretical and philosophical models.¹¹⁶

The most famous essay representing Cultural Materialism is Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield’s “History and Ideology: The Instance of *Henry V*,” and it states that the main strategy of ideology “is to legitimate inequality and exploitation by representing the social order that perpetuates these things as immutable and unalterable – as decreed by God or simply natural. Since the Elizabethan period, the ideological appeal to God has tended to give way to the equally powerful appeal to the natural.”¹¹⁷

¹¹⁵ Montrose, *The Purpose of Playing*, 8.

¹¹⁶ Graham Holderness, ed., *Shakespeare’s History Plays: Richard II to Henry V* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1992), 29-30.

¹¹⁷ Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield, “History and Ideology, Masculinity and Miscegenation: The Instance of *Henry V*,” in *Shakespeare’s History Plays*, ed. R.J.C. Watt (London and New York: Longman, 2002), 205.

It has now been approximately three decades since Cultural Materialism and New Historicism were at the height of their popularity, and while New Historicism has had its critics and scholars (generally speaking) have moved on to other points of view, Cultural Materialism on the other hand seems to have had more staying power and is still referred to in more recent criticism. Watt includes Dollimore and Sinfield's extended essay in his own book, *Shakespeare's History Plays* (not to be confused with Holderness' collection of essays of the same name), and within the essay's introduction Watt draws attention to where he has selected it from: Sinfield's 1992 book titled *Faultlines*. The title itself is loaded with relevance, since fault lines "are those points at which the dominant discourses of a culture can be revealed as contradictory, so allowing the prising apart of ideology from power and giving a hearing to voices which challenge the culturally dominant forces."¹¹⁸

When trying to differentiate the two theories, the most important distinction between them appears to be that Cultural Materialism does not expect a specific conclusion when it is applied, where New Historicism does expect a certain result. This may explain why Cultural Materialism may come across as having had a longer life than New Historicism. Given that the two flagship essays that represent New Historicism and Cultural Materialism ("Invisible Bullets", and "History and Ideology") both deal with Prince Hal/Henry V and the Shakespeare plays in which he appears, the review of both theories, brief as it may be, was a necessary piece of this research.

Holderness, Rackin, and Recent Perspectives

Graham Holderness and Phyllis Rackin also appear in the 1980s as major scholars of Shakespeare's History plays, both of whom have continued to write well into the twenty-first

¹¹⁸ Watt, *Shakespeare's History Plays*, 204.

century, but I mention them together because of their work on the plays as historiography. Holderness was most definitely part of the New Historicism/Cultural Materialism wave when it became popular (see above), but he is critical of both movements' shortcomings and has modified his own opinion over the years. Holderness has contributed multiple works on the History plays, including *Shakespeare's History* (1985) and *Shakespeare: The Histories* (2000), while Rackin has also published multiple books, including her often-cited *Stages of History* (1990), as well as *Engendering a Nation: A Feminist Account of Shakespeare's English Histories* (1997), co-written with Jean. E. Howard. Holderness states in *Shakespeare's History*, that there is "no necessity for simple readings of the plays as mirrors of Elizabethan society,"¹¹⁹ and that "in historiographical terms the plays enact a radical shift from the monarchist framework of the Tudor myth to a problematic of secular and positivist historiography,"¹²⁰ which Holderness saw as an emerging cultural debate. When Holderness returned to the History plays in 2000 for *Shakespeare: The Histories*, he proposes that there appears to be two seemingly opposing views on how to interpret the History plays through modern criticism; the chronicle plays were perceived as either being created by Shakespeare as a unified whole, or seen as being created independently from one another, in reaction to the contemporary pressures that shaped both Shakespeare's personal circumstances and the world at large. Holderness takes the stance that those two views are no longer incompatible.¹²¹ Phyllis Rackin clearly states, from the outset, that her book is "an attempt to historicize Shakespeare's historical practice – to situate his English history plays in the context of Tudor historiography, in his theater, and in his world."¹²² She highlights the shift in thought of the Renaissance from a providential justification of events, to that of a Machiavellian explanation,

¹¹⁹ Graham Holderness, *Shakespeare's History* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1985), 225.

¹²⁰ Holderness, *Shakespeare's History*, 222.

¹²¹ Graham Holderness, *Shakespeare: The Histories* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000), 8-9.

¹²² Phyllis Rackin, *Stages of History* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990), ix.

and also points out the parallel that exists in how Shakespeare's history plays have been interpreted.¹²³ In her second chapter, Rackin, like Holderness, proposes two camps of thought: the first being the Tudor myth, and the second, the rebellion against the Tudor myth. Rackin breaks the second camp into two parts of its own, the first being the refusal of ideology, and the second being an attack on the Tudor myth itself.¹²⁴ What Rackin later states in the same chapter, is that History is never created in the moment; it is always created in retrospect. As a result, "the criticism of the 1940s and 1950s found in the medieval world, and in Shakespeare's representations of it, a story of national union and English patriotism that answered to their own desires and needs, just as the radical criticism of the present finds a story of conflict and subversion."¹²⁵ Rackin suggests that the order in which the two tetralogies were written (the three *Henry VI* plays along with *Richard III*, followed by *Richard II*, *Henry IV 1* and *2*, and *Henry V*) reflect Renaissance historiography, and that the "unresolved contradictions" of *Henry V* are in fact the historiographic project that Shakespeare has undertaken.¹²⁶

Ronald Knowles, like John Wilders, discusses not only Shakespeare's English History plays, but his Roman and Greek plays as well. What sets Knowles apart from the other scholars mentioned thus far, is that his approach to surveying the plays is strictly from a rhetorical point of view. By applying "argument," and its various definitions, to each of the History plays Knowles does not have to wade into the depths of previous criticism, nor does he look at Shakespeare's use of the sources available to him. Knowles states that "recognition of the function of argument at the heart of drama adds a huge dimension which, heretofore, has been overlooked or undervalued in

¹²³ Rackin, *Stages of History*, x.

¹²⁴ Rackin, *Stages of History*, 40-1.

¹²⁵ Rackin, *Stages of History*, 59.

¹²⁶ Rackin, *Stages of History*, 85.

Shakespeare criticism,”¹²⁷ and as a result he presents a fresh perspective of the History (and Roman) plays, and one that does not need another theory in which to make its own point.

Another fresh, and extremely new, perspective, is that of Isabel Karremann. In her 2015 book, *The Drama of Memory in Shakespeare's History Plays*, Karremann very interestingly, integrates memory studies into her view of the history plays. She states that “oblivion” (that is, forgetting) is also an important element, and not only restricted to “memory.” Her “oblivion” approach offers a new perspective on the history plays, and she states her aim is to show how the plays engage with the English nation’s past as a “dynamic interplay between remembering and forgetting through which the collective memory is formed and transformed.”¹²⁸ This book emerges as a new option in how to view the history plays, and like Knowles, Karremann’s approach does not need to refer to, or rely on, other theories. In fact, the phrase ‘Tudor myth’ appears in her book only three times. Karremann is a professor at Wurzburg University in Germany and proves to be a refreshing break from the British and North American viewpoints that dominate the scholarship of the History plays.

Having now read a great deal of criticism and theory related to Shakespeare’s Histories, while continually sifting through more, something has emerged as an important theme when considering *Henry V*. The time in which one is currently living, and I dare say one’s own personal experiences, will affect how that person may end up viewing the History plays, and the potential purpose of staging them.

¹²⁷ Ronald Knowles, *Shakespeare's Argument with History* (New York: Palgrave, 2002), 2.

¹²⁸ Isabel Karremann, *The Drama of Memory in Shakespeare's History Plays* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 183.

Shakespeare's Prince Hal (*1 and 2 Henry IV*)

Similar to the way in which some scholars have proposed opposing views on Shakespeare's History Cycle, I have found that there are two distinct ways in which many scholars have viewed the progression of Prince Hal into Henry V throughout Shakespeare's plays; he is either seen as the perfect monarch, who becomes the ideal king,¹²⁹ or he is a Machiavellian Prince who uses his position of privilege to manipulate those around him as part of a reformation to make him look all the better when he comes to power.¹³⁰ Hal/Henry does not have many soliloquies throughout the three plays (*Henry V* being the third), and does not have the benefit, of say a Hamlet, who steps out multiple times to talk directly to the audience in order to share his inner-thoughts. As a result, Hal becomes a more difficult character to pin down, than say Hamlet, Iago, or Richard, who all have multiple soliloquies in which to connect with the audience. Most of the debate, or division of opinions, about Hal begins with his very first appearance. In his first scene of *1 Henry IV* (1.ii), following multiple exchanges with Falstaff and then with Poins, after speaking in prose thus far, Hal switches to verse when he is alone, at which time he states,

I know you all, and will awhile uphold
The unyoked humour of your idleness.
Yet herein will I imitate the sun,
Who doth permit the base contagious clouds
To smother up his beauty from the world,
That, when he please again to be himself,
Being wanted, he may be more wondered at
By breaking through the foul and ugly mists

¹²⁹ J. Dover Wilson, *The Fortunes of Falstaff* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1943), 17.

This positive interpretation is reflected in the productions directed by and featuring John Kemble (1789 and 1806), William Macready (1839), Samuel Phelps (1852), Charles Kean (1859), and Charles Calvert (1872).

¹³⁰ William Hazlitt, A.C. Bradley, Harold C. Goddard, Gerald Gould, and Harold Bloom all have negative views on King Henry, with Hazlitt's *Character's of Shakespeare's Plays* (1817) setting the tone for many negative comments that were to follow. Hal has been described as Machiavellian as recently as 2014, in Benjamin Waldraft's *Shakespeare's Hal in "Henry IV" as the Prototypical Machiavellian Prince? An Analysis*.

Perhaps best exemplified in Michael Pennington's portrayal of Henry V in the 1986 English Shakespeare Company production.

Of vapours that did seem to strangle him.
(1.ii.185-193)

Some see this as the character presenting his plan to the audience, ensuring them that he will change his ways, and that it is part of a deliberate arc that he has set for himself so that his reformation will be stronger when he turns his back on the vices that he is currently enjoying. I had a conversation in 2008 with actor Douglas Rain, an original member of the Stratford Festival acting company, who played not only Prince Hal and Henry V, but eventually Henry IV as well. I asked him what his thoughts were of that soliloquy, and he was of the opinion that Shakespeare was using the speech as a type of reassurance to the monarchy of his time, that despite Hal's antics at the moment, the character was going to "pay the debt (he) never promised," eventually take on the responsibility of being King, and be a shining example of how a ruler should behave.¹³¹ This is somewhat problematic though, if the assumption is that Shakespeare has given a character a speech within a play simply for the purpose of appeasing a current ruler who could potentially be offended by the portrayal of an earlier monarch who happened to be from the same family tree. The anonymous play *The Famous Victories of Henry the Fifth*, which precedes Shakespeare's *1 Henry IV*,¹³² presents a far worse representation of the Prince, and that play managed to get past the Master of Revels. Now, it could be pointed out that if Falstaff was an amended character, having originally being named and based on Sir John Oldcastle (who gained the title Lord Cobham through his third marriage), then perhaps Hal could have been amended as well, and that Hal's "I know you all" speech was to address a potential problem with censorship. Well, Oldcastle was changed to Falstaff in Shakespeare's play in part because the post of Lord Chamberlain, between 1596 and 1597, was held by Sir William Brooke, the Lord Cobham at that time, who some believe

¹³¹ Consistent with the views of Goddard.

Harold C. Goddard, *The Meaning of Shakespeare Vol. 1* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951), 171.

¹³² *The Famous Victories* was entered into the Stationer Register in 1594, and *1 Henry IV* in 1598, although *Famous Victories* is believed to have been in performance as early as the 1580s.

did not want his title besmirched with Shakespeare's original portrayal of Oldcastle.¹³³ If Queen Elizabeth, or someone else of the nobility, was not happy with the portrayal of Prince Hal they would have had much more to dislike in the Prince of *Famous Victories*. If the nobility did not have an issue with that particular Prince, it makes little sense that they would have an issue with Shakespeare's Prince Hal. All that to say, it is unlikely that Shakespeare was apologizing for his character, or even reassuring his audience. Audiences would have already seen *Famous Victories*, and there were obviously worse portrayals of the Prince in other sources as well.¹³⁴

Approaching the character as a performer, even if Hal is revealing to the audience that his behaviour is part of a masterplan, he still cannot know the circumstances in which his plan will be tested, and he certainly does not know if it will be successful or not. To continue the sun metaphor which appears in the quoted soliloquy, the sun does not control the clouds, so it cannot break through when it is convenient for it, as much as Hal may wish it so. A constant note that I continue to give actors is 'you can't play the end of the story,' and another is 'your character doesn't know until they know.' Even though we the reader, or audience member, may have read or seen the plays before, or perhaps have even attended *Henry IV* and *Henry V* multiple times, the character of Henry does not know when his father will die, nor does he know that he will go on to win the battle of Agincourt. Those of us viewing the plays from the outside have to remind ourselves of this fact. With that in mind, I find the theory of a scheming, power hungry Prince who is sure of his success ultimately falls apart. Although there is little doubt Shakespeare knew he was going to write about the reign of Henry V while writing what would become *1 Henry IV*, there are enough dramatic differences along the way (the lack of physically seeing Falstaff in *Henry V* after being told at the

¹³³ Peter Corbin and Douglas Sedge, ed., *The Oldcastle controversy* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1991), 10.

¹³⁴ See Appendix 2 of this thesis.

end of 2 *Henry IV* that the story would continue with Falstaff, and the variations in the plays' structures) that it appears Shakespeare had not decided how he was going to tell Henry V's story until he sat down to write the play.

What other option is there? It seems to me, if Hal is not apologizing to a future nobility for his actions, and if he is not reassuring an audience that his behaviour is part of a set plan, then the only other person for whose benefit he is delivering the speech is himself. Hal is convincing himself that his current behaviour is fine, because it has the benefit of making him look better later. It is not a promise of future behaviour, so much as it is an excuse for his current behaviour. And I would argue that his current behaviour goes far beyond a young man enjoying his youth. It is pointed out as early as *Richard II* that Hal is not at his father's side but in the London taverns,¹³⁵ but who is the greater thief: Falstaff, and the rest of the rabble of the Boar's Head tavern, or his own father who has stolen England's crown? It is just as likely that Hal is not at his father's side, not because he is shirking duties that were never supposed to be his in the first place, but because he is disappointed in what has transpired and with his father's involvement with such a monumental shift.

Regardless of how one interprets Hal's first scene and soliloquy, what cannot be disputed is the importance of that speech. One could choose to cut the speech altogether, which may be a quick way to solve the problem,¹³⁶ but it robs the character of some of its great depth. How the director and actor decide to present "I know you all," sets the table for everything that comes after.

¹³⁵ *Richard II*, Act 5, Scene 3, lines 1 – 22.

¹³⁶ As was done in the Stratford Festival's *Breath of Kings*, a combining and editing of *Richard II* through *Henry V* into two productions.

Shakespeare's King Henry (*Henry V*)

As part of my course work, I spent a good portion of my time not only reading *Henry V* on multiple occasions, but also surveying prompt scripts of past productions, as well as viewing various film versions of the play. It is rare that a production of the play does not edit the text in some form. Whether this involves the rearranging of scenes and lines, or possibly the cutting of a scene altogether, any editorial decision will affect how the play, and the character of King Henry, is perceived and judged. Two specific moments in Shakespeare's *Henry V* that become strong barometers as to how an audience views King Henry is his threat during the siege of Harfleur, as well as his decision to kill the French prisoners during the battle of Agincourt. How a production decides to deal with these two moments is at the very heart of what kind of king they are trying to portray. By comparing the three most recent film adaptations, one can see a progression in how King Henry has been presented, and how that progression matches the views of the play's literary criticism over the past seventy-five years. Those three films are Laurence Olivier's 1944 movie based on the play, Kenneth Branagh's 1989 film, and Thea Sharrock's 2012 television-film which concluded the first season of *The Hollow Crown* for the BBC.¹³⁷

The Threat Before Harfleur

Much has been said and written about Olivier's iconic film. It is referenced in the introduction to both the Arden and Oxford editions of the text, as well as the RSC edition published by Modern Library, not to mention various articles such as Marsha McCreadie's "*Henry V: Onstage and On Film.*" Olivier's *Henry V* was commissioned, shot, and released during the second

¹³⁷ *Henry V*. Film. Directed by Laurence Olivier. UK: Two Cities Films, 1944.; *Henry V*. Film. Directed by Kenneth Branagh. UK: BBC Films/Renaissance Films, 1989.; *The Hollow Crown: Henry V*. Television Film. Directed by Thea Sharrock. UK: BBC Two, 2012.

World War, as part of his military service to England. The film itself begins with the dedication “To the Commandos and Airborne Troops of Great Britain – the spirit of whose ancestors it has humbly been attempted to recapture in some ensuing scenes.” Given that the movie is very much a propaganda film, it should come as no surprise that this King Henry is cast in a very positive light and is given as heroic a portrayal as one can hope for. Henry’s threat at the gate of Harfleur, delivered to the Governor of the town, is essentially cut in its entirety. Henry begins Act 3 scene 3 with his first two lines, ending with “This is the latest parle we will admit.”, but then no “parle” follows whatsoever. The scene then jumps immediately to the Governor’s response and his decision to yield to Henry’s “soft mercy.” There is no threat to “Defile the locks” of their “shrill-shrieking daughters,” no proposal to take their fathers by the silver beard and dash “their most reverend heads” against the walls, nor are there any promises to spit their naked infants “upon pikes.” After the surge of troops following Henry’s “Once more unto the breach” speech, it seems that all that is left for the Governor to do is surrender the town.

With Branagh’s adaptation, forty-five years after Olivier’s, we certainly see a different approach to this section of the play. While the speech outside the gates is edited and cut down from what appears in Shakespeare’s play, Branagh has kept in all of the specific threats that Olivier cut out. It begins well enough, and appears in the film as follows:

How yet resolves the governor of the town?
This is the latest parle we will admit;
Therefore to our best mercy give yourselves;
Or like to men proud of destruction
Defy us to our worst: for, as I am a soldier,
If I begin the battery once again,
I will not leave the half-achieved Harfleur
Till in her ashes she lie buried.

(3.iii.1-5, 7-9)

The speech is fairly intact, only excluding the sixth line. However, the speech then jumps to the mid-point of line 27, and continues on:

Therefore, you men of Harfleur,
Take pity of your town and of your people,
Whiles yet my soldiers are in my command;
Whiles yet the cool and temperate wind of grace
O'erblows the filthy and contagious clouds
Of heady murder, spoil and villany.
If not, why, in a moment look to see
The blind and bloody soldier with foul hand
Defile the locks of your shrill-shrieking daughters;
Your fathers taken by the silver beards,
And their most reverend heads dash'd to the walls,
Your naked infants spitted upon pikes,
Whiles the mad mothers with their howls confused
Do break the clouds.
What say you? will you yield, and this avoid,
Or, guilty in defence, be thus destroy'd?
(3.iii.27-40, 42-43)

Other than cutting the passage referring to the wives of Jewry near the end of the speech, the remaining section is quite complete. Without a responsibility to honour contemporary soldiers, as Olivier had, Branagh appears to be willing to give us a Henry that is more complicated. Given that both the Korean and Vietnam wars,¹³⁸ as well as the United Kingdom's involvement with the Falklands War,¹³⁹ had all taken place by the time Branagh had started making his movie there had been a shift in how international conflicts were being perceived generally and how they were being presented on stage and in film.

There is, however, something else to take note of in Branagh's film, and that is Henry's reaction to the Governor's surrender. Once the Governor of Harfleur states that they "no longer are defensible," Branagh's Henry clearly takes a huge sigh of relief. Does that sigh indicate

¹³⁸ The Korean War ran from June 1950 – July 1953, and the Vietnam War lasted November 1955 to April 1975.

¹³⁹ A ten-week conflict in early 1982 between the United Kingdom and Argentina over the sovereignty of the Falkland Islands in the South Atlantic, a territory that the UK had been linked to as far back as 1765.

Henry's relief in not having to go through with his threat? Or was Henry bluffing with his speech, never intending to carry out his suggested actions, and is he relieved that his bluff was not called? Either way, it is clear that Branagh's Henry had no desire to perform the actions with which he threatened the Governor of Harfleur.

In Thea Sharrock's *Henry V*, featuring Tom Hiddleston, we have another thought-provoking representation. Building upon the text in Branagh's adaptation, Sharrock's Henry is given the speech almost in its entirety. Very little is cut out, which gives this Henry many more horrible things to say, which includes placing the blame of what is potentially to come upon the citizens of Harfleur themselves, and more text of what will become of their "fresh fair virgins".

The gates of mercy shall be all shut up,
And the flesh'd soldier, rough and hard of heart,
In liberty of bloody hand shall range
With conscience wide as hell, mowing like grass
Your fresh-fair virgins and your flowering infants.
What is it then to me, if impious war,
Array'd in flames like to the prince of fiends,
Do, with his smirch'd complexion, all fell feats
Enlink'd to waste and desolation?
What is't to me, when you yourselves are cause,
If your pure maidens fall into the hand
Of hot and forcing violation?

(3.iii.10-21)

Even though lines 22 up through the first half of line 27 are still missing Sharrock's text is much more menacing, and even includes the previously missing "as did the wives of Jewry/At Herod's bloody-hunting slaughtermen." (3.iii.40-41)

But beyond the additional text within the speech itself, what also makes this scene more interesting is the way it is staged within its location. Both Olivier and Branagh are seen on horseback, looking up at the Governor on the walls of Harfleur. A common way of staging the scene to be sure, is to have the Governor and sometimes some other citizens upon the wall, but

that is a stage direction that does not appear in the Quarto or the Folio versions of Shakespeare's play. In Sharrock's film Henry rides through a primary gate on horseback and the Governor is dragged before the King and made to kneel. This Henry is not shouting his threat up at a distant man on a wall. Hiddleston's Henry is above the Governor, looking down at him from his horse, and in much closer proximity. Added to this alternate dynamic, is the fact that the Governor is surrounded by many citizens of Harfleur, many of whom are women and children. Henry's threat very quickly becomes much more horrible when the people he is threatening to harm are present during the threat, not to mention that Hiddleston delivers a far more ambiguous, and ultimately more dangerous, threat.

The Order to Kill the French Prisoners

In Shakespeare's play there are three references to Henry ordering the killing of French Prisoners during the battle of Agincourt. The first is at the very end of Act 4 scene 6, following Exeter's account of the Duke of York's death. As the scene concludes there is an alarum, Henry tells us that the French have "reinforced their scattered men," and he then makes the decision to "give the word through" that "every soldier kill his prisoners."

But hark, what new alarum is this same?
The French have reinforced their scattered men.
Then every soldier kill his prisoners!
Give the word through.

(4.vi.35-38)

The second reference is in the following scene, during the exchange between Fluellen and Gower after they have discovered that the luggage train has been attacked and the boys have been killed by the French. Gower responds to Fluellen, saying:

'Tis certain there's not a boy left alive; and the
cowardly rascals that ran from the battle ha' done
this slaughter: besides, they have burned and
carried away all that was in the king's tent;
wherefore the king, most worthily, hath caused every
soldier to cut his prisoner's throat. O, 'tis a gallant king!
(4.vii.5-10)

It would seem by Gower's exchange that Henry's order is in response to the French burning his tent and carrying away his belongings, and not in response to the killing of the boys. The third reference to killing French prisoners is an additional threat to do so by Henry. Later in the same scene, following Fluellen and Gower's section, Henry enters with French prisoners. He begins his speech with "I was not angry since I came to France" but it is not explicitly clear what has angered him. The killing of the boys? The attack on the luggage train?

I was not angry since I came to France
Until this instant. Take a trumpet, herald;
Ride thou unto the horsemen on yon hill:
If they will fight with us, bid them come down,
Or void the field; they do offend our sight:
If they'll do neither, we will come to them,
And make them skirr away, as swift as stones
Enforced from the old Assyrian slings:
Besides, we'll cut the throats of those we have,
And not a man of them that we shall take
Shall taste our mercy. Go and tell them so.
(4.vii.54-64)

Before the English herald even has an opportunity to leave, the French herald, Montjoy, enters and announces that the day belongs to England, which seemingly prevents the execution of these remaining prisoners.

So, how is this series of events involving French prisoners displayed in the three films? With Olivier's film, if his treatment of the threat at Harfleur is any indication, it is probably not all that surprising to learn that not a single one of the moments regarding French prisoners appears in

Olivier's version of *Henry V*. Olivier does however make the decision to show the French attacking the English camp and killing the boys. So, although France would have been an ally at the time when Oliver was making the film, he did not shirk away from portraying the French in a negative light while making every effort to eliminate elements of the story that would make us question Henry's actions within the battle.

Branagh's grittier movie may cause us to expect a much grittier, and more ambiguous, portrayal of King Henry during this section of the film. If that is the case, then one would be disappointed. Branagh also decides to remove all three references to the killing of French prisoners. Branagh, like Olivier, gives us a greater visual of the effects of the French attack on the luggage train, and the boys that have been killed in that particular attack, which certainly builds sympathy for the English. But by removing Henry's order, that sympathy is created by the vilifying of the French.

Turning our attention to *The Hollow Crown* installment of *Henry V*, we now see Henry making tough decisions and giving questionable orders. Fluellen and Gower's conversation does not appear in Sharrock's *Henry V*, so there is no discussion about Henry's order, but we do have Henry giving the order to execute the French prisoners. In fact, the two moments that Henry speaks about killing the prisoners have been conflated into one single moment. Once Exeter has told Henry about the death of the Duke of York, there is the sound of horses which grabs Henry's attention. We hear the line about the French reinforcing their scattered men, but then the script jumps to the section that normally follows the scene between Fluellen and Gower. There is no indication of the French attacking the luggage train and killing the boys, either through discussion or visually on screen. Henry proclaims that he "was not angry since (he) came to France/Until this instant" but given the edits and changes it is even more ambiguous as to what exactly has angered

King Henry. Is it because the French are regrouping for another charge? It certainly is not because the boys have been killed: that appears to not have happened at all in this particular version. What becomes the most probable is that Henry is very much upset about the death of York, and in the face of another possible charge by the French, Henry's anger boils over and he gives the order to kill the prisoners. Exeter has an additional "My, lord" added to the scene, clearly as a form of protest to the order, but the King cuts off anything Exeter may have additionally said, and this is where we jump back in the text and have the original order now become the reiteration of the order. And not only do we have the order given in this production, but we also *witness* Exeter give the command for the archers to shoot the prisoners at point blank range. Hardly cutting their throats, but I am not convinced that this is in any way better, and it certainly would not matter to the French prisoners, the result being the same.

Final thoughts on the Three Films

I originally selected these three films to explore the two key moments of the story because there has been a number of years between the release of each film (forty-five years between Olivier and Branagh, and twenty-three years between Branagh and Sharrock), and I hoped to show how the portrayal of Henry has changed over those years. Also, there is a greater possibility for people having had the opportunity to watch the movies. It is much easier to track down or purchase a film than it is an archival recording of the 1975 RSC production, for example. However, what additionally becomes clear, is that in the world of cinema it is much easier, and I dare say necessary in this medium, to cut much of the *text* during battles in order to *show* sections of the battle itself. And not only can film give us images of the battle, and all of the horrors that come with it, but we

are also given the opportunity to see events happen that are only talked about in the play (see the death of York, or the killing of the French prisoners).

But turning back to my original question: has there been a change in how Henry has been portrayed? I think the answer is a clear “yes.” Olivier’s Henry neither threatens the citizens of Harfleur, nor does he order the killing of French prisoners. Branagh’s Henry is vicious before the gates of Harfleur, although there is a strong indication that he had no intention of going through with his threat, and like Olivier, Branagh’s Henry gives no order to kill the prisoners. By the time we reach Sharrock’s 2012 film we have quite the change from Olivier’s famous version. Henry is ruthless at Harfleur, and there is no clear indication that he is bluffing, and not only does Henry order the killing of the French prisoners, but any indication that he is a “gallant king” for doing so or had any cause to give the order in the first place does not appear in the film.

So, why the change in the portrayal? Before Olivier’s film there is a history of productions removing any negative aspects of King Henry’s actions (William Macready in 1839, Charles Kean in 1859),¹⁴⁰ but there had also been a shift back to including some of those scenes (Charles Calvert in 1872,¹⁴¹ as well as Tyrone Guthrie’s 1937 production which featured Olivier as King Henry). The most likely answer is that Olivier’s film was in support of British troops fighting and serving in the second World War. I think a person would be hard pressed to find anyone who does not think that the British involvement in that war was necessary. To cast its hero negatively would be doing a disservice to those whom the film is dedicated. By the time we reach Branagh’s movie, people are much more critical of a military presence in foreign countries, and the motives for such a presence, given how the military conflicts that followed World War II shifted how the public

¹⁴⁰ Robert R. Spanabel, “A Stage History of Henry the Fifth: 1583-1859” (PhD diss., The Ohio State University, 1969). Charles Kean, *King Henry the Fifth* (adapted 1859) (London: Cornmarket Press, 1971).

¹⁴¹ Richard Foulkes, “Charles Calvert’s Henry V,” *Shakespeare Survey* 41. (1988): 23-34.

viewed such actions. Prior to Branagh's film, and the 1984 RSC production that he performed in under the direction of Adrian Noble, the UK had been involved in the Falklands War as mentioned earlier. A strong case can be made that the conflict over the Falkland Islands had an impact on productions of *Henry V*, specifically those done in England. By the time we reach Sharrock's *Henry V*, the film should be considered within the context of the attacks of 9/11 as well as the ensuing, drawn out Afghanistan war,¹⁴² a long-lasting military conflict that has no shortage of critics.

When viewing these three films, in addition to well-documented theatre productions, it may be most easily concluded that our view of war at any given time is a strong indication of how King Henry has been portrayed and presented at that moment, and that those same views of war led to the dramaturgical decisions that are made when editing Shakespeare's *Henry V* for production. An audience's opinion of the play, and its characters, will always be, on some level, affected by what is currently happening in the world around them. A director or dramaturge will be either influencing those opinions by what they decide to leave in and what to take out, or they themselves will be influenced as they are making their decisions.

Conclusion

If a director eliminates certain sections of the play then the character of King Henry, and the play as a whole, will lose some of its complexity. That is not to say that every production of *Henry V* should be uncut. There is a great difference between editing a play to bring it down to a reasonable running time while maintaining its integrity as a whole, and editing a play in order to

¹⁴² The War in Afghanistan began October 2001 in response to the terrorist attacks in New York City on September 11, 2001. The conflict is still ongoing and is currently the second longest US war, behind only the Vietnam War.

change how a character is perceived. If a director is producing the play with an agenda, that is, with the aim to simply condemn war or contrarily to promote the deeds strictly as heroic, then a great deal of the play's nuance is lost. James Shapiro has a fantastic quotation regarding *Henry V* in his book, *1599: A Year in the Life of Shakespeare*. He says *Henry V* "wasn't a pro-war play or an anti-war play but a going-to-war play."¹⁴³ Norman Rabkin touched on this theme a number of years earlier in his well-read 1977 essay, "Rabbits, Ducks, and *Henry V*." In it, Rabkin likens the opinions of *Henry V* to a gestaltist drawing where it can appear to be either a rabbit or a duck. He argues that the play's "ultimate power is precisely the fact that it points in two opposite directions, virtually daring us to choose one of the two opposed interpretations it requires of us."¹⁴⁴ I find myself disagreeing with Rabkin's suggestion that the play has two possible interpretations in which to choose from; Rabbit or Duck. To continue using his gestaltist metaphor, the image is in fact both Rabbit *and* Duck, and depending on how one views the image informs what they can see. *Henry V* is also many things at the same time and it is the responsibility of the theatre artists to reveal as much of what is there as they can. And although I do not agree with his quotation above, I do agree with Rabkin's final conclusion, in that with *Henry V* "ambiguity is the heart of the matter, the single most important fact we must confront in plucking out the mystery of the world we live."¹⁴⁵

In consideration of all the historical and literary theory that I have reviewed, and given how perceptions of the play and title character can be affected by how any given production approaches the text, I am of the opinion that the play is at its strongest when productions use the ambiguities that are present to their advantage and allow them to weigh upon the audience. The director and actors most certainly have to make choices in how they are telling the story, but if scenes and

¹⁴³ James Shapiro, *A Year in the Life of William Shakespeare (1599)* (New York: Harper Collins, 2005), 92.

¹⁴⁴ Norman Rabkin, "Rabbits, Ducks, and *Henry*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 28, no. 3 (Summer 1977): 279.

¹⁴⁵ Rabkin, "Rabbits, Ducks, and *Henry V*," 296.

passages are removed for the purpose of presenting a specific ideological version of a character or events, then a disservice has been done to the play and its characters.

If there is anything that I have gleaned from all of the production history and literary criticism that I have gone through regarding Shakespeare's *Henry V*, it is that one must not wrestle with the play's ambiguity but, in fact, embrace it.

ASSESSMENT CHAPTER

The production component of my thesis came together quite well. There were both pros and cons with producing *Henry V* as part of the Greystone Theatre season and like any production some compromises were made along the way. Nonetheless, ultimately the advantages of doing the production through the Drama Department at the University of Saskatchewan far outweighed the disadvantages.

One of the elements of production that had to be contended with was rehearsal time. Rehearsals stretched from October 22, 2018 until our preview on November 21, which at first glance is a good amount of time for the rehearsal of a play. However, we were not rehearsing under the conditions of a professional production which would have meant eight-hour rehearsal days, six days per week, usually for three weeks but sometimes more depending on the theatre company. We were rehearsing for four hours in the evenings of weekdays along with a three- or four-hour timeslot on Sunday afternoons. So, comparatively we had the same amount of rehearsal hours as a two-week process as we made our way into tech weekend; not a lot of time. Add the fact that many of the undergraduate drama students involved had never been in a production of a Shakespeare play before (another drawback to producing the play through Greystone) and one can quickly see how more rehearsal time would have been beneficial; this was especially true since the students were also taking anywhere between three to six university courses in addition to the rehearsal and performance schedule. This also limited some of the research elements that I would have liked to implement into the rehearsal process because I was concerned with potentially overloading the students with additional work.

As to the perks of producing the play as part of Greystone's theatre season, there are many. First, there is no possible way that I would have been able to assemble a cast of twenty-one actors to join me on stage if the play had been produced independently; and only the largest of professional theatres would be able to afford to hire that many artists to work on a production. By having a larger cast not only was I able to involve many undergraduates on the project but it allowed me to keep more characters in my edit of the play and fill out a number of the scenes that would have to have been stripped down if the production had been done with only ten to twelve actors.

Second, there was tremendous technical support for the production through the Drama Department's technical courses. Similar to the acting company, there were many more people available to contribute to the production's technical elements (design, construction, and operation) than if the production had been staged independently. The fact that there was a designer assigned to each element (set, costumes, lighting, props, and in this production's case projection) was in itself a benefit. It is not uncommon for designers to be asked to take on more than one element for a production, so knowing that one person was responsible for each design was reassuring. The production also benefitted by the involvement of Carla Orosz (set design) and Beverley Kobelsky (costume design); both women are busy, talented, professional designers in addition to their duties at the Drama Department and are no strangers to Shakespeare's plays having worked many seasons for Shakespeare on the Saskatchewan. So, even if this production had taken place outside of Greystone Theatre, I could not have hoped to have worked with two stronger designers or better people, and it would have been impossible to work with the two of them on an independent production of *Henry V*. Additionally, by working with the technical students I had the privilege of having a full stage management team of three people. Independent productions almost always have

only one, and even with productions at larger theatre companies it is rare to see a team of more than two stage managers since the cost of having an additional stage manager is often prohibitive.

A third benefit of doing the production through Greystone was that I did not have to concern myself personally with administrative or promotional duties that fall to many artists when producing independently. Since Greystone Theatre already has people and infrastructure in place, I did not have to deal with creating press releases, coordinate media call, or set up the box office. I certainly had to proof material and respond to media requests, but I did not have to create any content which allowed me to keep my focus on rehearsals and production. A major drawback of producing independently is that all of the administrative tasks fall to the artistic team as well, since they are one in the same. The end result is often a creative team that is spread thin and as a result one or more aspects of the production can suffer. I was able to avoid that individual burnout since I was able to focus on acting and directing.

Having read Ann Medaille's article "Creativity and Craft: The Information Seeking Behavior of Theatre Artists," found in the *Journal of Documentation*, I was comforted to know that my own personal desire for more research was not a unique one. She shows that theatre artists in general (playwrights, designers, as well as directors and actors) consider research a vital part of their job with 86.3% of the survey's participants agreeing or strongly agreeing with the statement "Research is an important part of my preparation for a theatre production."¹⁴⁶ It is also clear that research is a task that many artists enjoy undertaking. However, her research has also shown that theatre artists have "expressed various sources of frustration with conducting research," with some artists stating that they "find it challenging to do so much work well in advance of their first

¹⁴⁶ Ann Medaille, "Creativity and Craft: The Information Seeking Behavior of Theatre Artists," *Journal of Documentation* 66, no. 3 (April 2010): 335.

paychecks.”¹⁴⁷ I also found it interesting when participants in the study were asked what *kind* of research they relied on, their replies included “favorite well-worn books, which include dictionaries, pronunciation dictionaries, lexicons, foreign language dictionaries and sources, theatre history books, costume and scenic history books, fashion books, art history books, theatre encyclopedias and guides, textual and critical analyses of plays, and art books.” Medaille added that theatre artists “also regularly consult popular newspapers and magazines, as well as scholarly journals and magazines about theatre, film, dance, art, and music.”¹⁴⁸ So, theatre artists are in fact hungry for information to help shape their performance, their design, or their production, but it seems that they are only scratching the surface when it comes to where they can be looking for that helpful information. If theatre artists are consulting scholarly journals and magazines, then perhaps they should go beyond the publications of their own field. Would it be worth looking at scholarly publications written by historians? Could an artist perhaps turn to an expert on a particular topic from outside the theatre circle, one who can bring a different perspective to the topic or subject? These were the questions that helped shape our creative process, and one that I believe was beneficial for both audience and acting company.

Audience feedback

During the run of the production, audiences were invited to voluntarily fill out an anonymous questionnaire with five questions. The first two questions were regarding certain production elements and how helpful they were in assisting to make the story as clear as possible: the use of projections and the clarity of actors playing multiple roles in the play. The next two

¹⁴⁷ Medaille, “Creativity and Craft,” 335-6.

¹⁴⁸ Medaille, “Creativity and Craft,” 339-40.

questions were related to a pair of specific moments linked to King Henry's motivations: his decision to invade France, and whether or not he would have made good on his threats before the gates of Harfleur. The final question was to see how familiar the audience members were with the play itself: have they seen it before? Read the play? Seen movie adaptations? Or are they familiar with the play at all?

There were one hundred and seventy-five questionnaires that were submitted over the ten performances of the play's run, which represents just over 24% of the total house count (722). I do know of a few students who saw the production more than once so assuming that they did not potentially fill out the survey multiple times then there is a chance that the true percentage is higher.

Results

1. Did you find the projections helpful in knowing which location the play was currently in?

Over 91% of those who submitted questionnaires found the projections helpful when watching the production (160 of the 175 responded 'yes'). With *Henry V* there is the convention of the Chorus throughout the play, who from their very first speech is imploring the audience to use their imagination. So, while it was important to me that the projections do not try to do the Chorus' work for them, we as storytellers must also remind ourselves to make no assumptions about what the audience may or may not know about the play prior to watching the production. They only get one opportunity to absorb the exposition that is being thrown at them, and with a play that is continually moving back and forth to different locations I wanted to help the audience and give them the best possible chance at following the story.

I think it is worth mentioning that those who stated that the projections were not helpful do not necessarily think that the projections were problematic either. They may have simply felt that

they followed the changes in location well enough on their own. However, I had anticipated that if someone was to find the projections unhelpful then it was most likely because they had already read or seen the play previously. In that I was incorrect. Of the fifteen individuals who did not find the projections helpful six of them were not familiar with the play at all while the other nine had read the play or seen a film or television adaptation. Only one of those nine had seen the play prior to this production. Additionally, it appears that two of the ‘no’s were strictly technical: one person stated that they found the font that was used for the projections hard to read, and another said they could not see the projections (which I am assuming is most likely a sight line issue if they happened to be sitting either in the right or left upstage corners).

2. *With some actors playing multiple roles, did you feel confident knowing when actors were playing different characters?*

I have found with directing some of Shakespeare’s plays prior to this production that, despite our best efforts, it is not always clear to some audience members when an actor has taken on the task of acting another role within the play. Despite having a cast of twenty-two actors, we still had some performers playing two or three roles over the duration of the performance of *Henry V*, since there was thirty-five characters to be portrayed even in this version of the script. I also knew that Greystone Theatre does not print a multi-page program for their productions where I would be able to list every character’s full name and title, who is related to who and how, or make various connections to previous plays in the tetralogy (*Richard II* and both parts of *Henry IV*); nor is there, as I have learned, any guarantee that all audience members will take the time to even read through a program before a performance begins, so even if we had taken the time to include all of that information it does not mean that it would have been seen. As a result, I knew that apart from the text itself, and the specific choices made by actors in their performances, the costuming would be

our biggest asset in indicating when actors were playing different roles. Of those that submitted questionnaires, over 96% (169 of 175) stated that they were confident knowing when actors were playing different characters. This does not imply that all of those audience members would be able to successfully state the characters' names, but it does suggest that most of the audience knew when actors were portraying a different character.

3. *In your opinion, based on this production, had Henry already decided to invade France when the play begins?*

When fulfilling the responsibilities of a director, I am often looking for moments where characters have to make a choice, and if at all possible, I much prefer it when those moments happen on stage. The first decision that is made in the play is whether King Henry is going to lay claim to the French throne. He has already laid claim to "certain dukedoms" as we are told by the French Ambassador, but Henry has not decided whether to claim the French crown or not at the play's beginning which is why the Archbishop of Canterbury has to present the case in which Henry's potential claim is legitimate.

Even though Henry has not officially made up his mind at the opening of the play, I was curious as to how the audience would respond to this question after they had seen the production. Over 48% (85 of 175) said that they thought Henry had already made up his mind to invade, with over 51% (90 of 175) saying that he had either not decided (59 of 175) or that they could not tell (31 of 175).

4. *Henry makes some horrible threats before the gates of Harfleur. Do you think he would have followed through with those threats?*

There are two particular moments that seem to have defined the various portrayals of Henry throughout the play's production history (as I have discussed earlier), and both are usually related to what is removed from the text or what is left in. The threat that Henry makes before the gates of Harfleur is one of these two moments and is often edited down or cut all together. I am of the opinion that *Henry V* is a play better served when the ambiguity of its central character is embraced, so I left the speech completely intact. I did not wish to go the way of Laurence Olivier and whitewash Henry in order to portray him strictly as a heroic leader who can do no wrong. That being said, as any actor playing a role, I had to make decisions regarding the character's intentions and motivations. I chose to play the moment as Henry making a threat that he did not want to follow through on. I thought the threat had to be made in such a way that the Governor of Harfleur would take it seriously, and then leave Henry's line "Use mercy to them all" to potentially reveal that he had no desire to actually allow those things to occur. I was extremely curious to see how that moment would be received. Of the 175 submitted, just over 44% (78 of 175) said yes, they believed Henry would follow through, over 48% (85) said no, and the remaining (12) decided to either write in that they could not tell (even though it was not an option), or did not answer at all.

The responses to questions 3 and 4 seem to only solidify the notion that despite the creative team making choices on how to play certain scenes, the ambiguity of the play results with the audience perceiving the same moment very differently.

5. *Prior to watching this production, were you familiar with Shakespeare's Henry V? Circle all that apply.*

Amongst Shakespeare enthusiasts, I think it would be safe to say that *Henry V* is a very well-known play, and could be considered the most popular History play with the exception of perhaps *Richard III*. However, there are many Shakespeare plays that have not been produced in

Saskatchewan before, let alone Saskatoon, and *Henry V* is a play that is rarely discussed as part of high school curriculums. So, I had assumed that many of the audience members would not have seen *Henry V* before, and many may not know the play at all. I wanted to know if that assumption appeared to be true, with the hope that if many audience members did not know the play, then perhaps they would not have a predetermined opinion of King Henry before the play began.

Just over 60% of those who completed the questionnaire were not familiar with the play at all (106 of 175), and of the remaining 69 individuals who did know the play many of them knew it through various, and often times, multiple mediums: 33 had read it previously, 35 had seen a television and/or film adaptation, 15 of them were familiar with the play through other media (i.e. graphic novels or radio). However, only 19 had ever previously seen the play performed live.

Acting Company feedback

Of the possible twenty-one questionnaires that could have been submitted over the two-week period following the final performance of *Henry V* there were thirteen received. I was required, understandably so, to wait until after I had submitted the final grades for Drama 318, the course I was teaching during the production of *Henry V*, before I could view the data of the Acting Company questionnaires. Since eight members of the cast were enrolled in that course, I had to ensure that there was no possibility of one of the students being affected positively or negatively by how they answered the questionnaire, or by deciding not to participate at all. Since there are no individual markers on the questionnaire there was minimal risk for something of that nature to occur, but the process is such so that everyone is protected and there certainly was no need for me to see the data right away. However, despite the questionnaire drop-box being available for the

acting company as early as the evening of December 1, my concern was with the ending of the term and with the beginning of final examinations taking place that many of the undergraduates would not only put off submitting the questionnaire until later but ultimately would forget or become too busy to complete it and drop it off. Ideally, I was hoping for eighteen or nineteen completed questionnaires, but thirteen is certainly better than none and still gives me some insight into how the acting company received some of the elements of our rehearsal process.

Results

1. Did you find the involvement of a Historian in the rehearsal process beneficial?

Dr. Sharon Wright joined rehearsals on Tuesday October 23, which was the second day of rehearsals and our first day of table work, where we start reading through the play scene by scene and ask questions about the characters and the plot, and start making some decisions about the play before we begin to put the scenes up on their feet. This was also the day of rehearsals when we viewed a short documentary about the battle of Agincourt, so that Dr. Wright could also answer any questions that may have come up from that viewing. More on that below.

All thirteen participants stated that having a Historian involved was beneficial.

2. Based on the time our Historian was available to be in rehearsals, was it too much? Just right? Too little?

Twelve stated that it was just the right amount, with one answering that it was too little. I would have liked to have had a Historian there for the duration of our table work before we started blocking the play, so I suppose I personally agree with the one individual. If all of the other participants felt that the time Dr. Wright shared with us was just the right amount then I have no doubt that they would have felt overwhelmed with the amount that I would have preferred. Perhaps

if they were not in the midst of university studies they may feel differently, but that cannot be known for certain.

3. *Did you find the involvement of an English Academic in the rehearsal process beneficial?*

Eleven answered that yes, they found the involvement of an Academic beneficial. Two stated that they did not find it beneficial; however, one of them specifically added that their answer was because the visit took place later in the process and they did not find it beneficial at that point in time. Dr. Joanne Rochester joined us on Monday November 19, prior to one of our dress rehearsals, two days before our preview audience on Wednesday November 21, and I would agree that it would have been more helpful had Dr. Rochester been able to visit earlier in rehearsals. To that end, Dr. Rochester and myself had indeed discussed an earlier visit but the challenge of coordinating her schedule with a time when we had the full company present resulted in the visit happening much later than the two of us had initially planned.

4. *Based on the time our Academic was available to be in rehearsals, was it too much? Just right? Too little?*

There was one response that the time spent with our Academic was too much. Unsurprisingly, it was one of the two that did not find the involvement of an English Academic beneficial in the first place; and not the one whose main complaint was regarding the timing of the visit. Nine stated that the time spent was the right amount and the final three said that it was too little time.

5. *Did you find the research assignment helpful?*

I asked the entire cast to partake in a small research project. Everyone, myself included, was to bring a piece of research into rehearsal to share with the rest of the company. It could be something about their character if they happened to be playing a historical character. It could be about a

location or an event that is relevant to the play. Most of the cast found interesting information about characters, some of which I had not come across myself since I was not looking as closely into some of the supporting characters' backgrounds. Others brought in and shared facts such as details about the siege of Harfleur, and details relating to the English bowmen. It was not designed to be a project that would take up a great deal of the actors' time but the hope was that if everyone contributed one thing, we would then have a great deal of information to share and be able to collectively understand where some of that information intersects.

All thirteen actors said they found the assignment helpful. Of all the results that were collected over both questionnaires this is the one that pleases me the most since this was the part of our rehearsal process that I had not based on a previous rehearsal experience, and was an original concept that I implemented.

6. Was the documentary that was viewed helpful as part of the rehearsal process?

As I mentioned earlier, on the second day of rehearsals when Dr. Wright visited the company, I screened a short documentary for the entire cast and those of the design team that were able to join us. This way Dr. Wright could speak to how some of the facts were presented in the documentary and give the company some answers to questions that they might have had. Twelve of the thirteen individuals who submitted questionnaires said they did find the documentary helpful, with only one stating that they did not find it helpful.

7. Did you view any of the other videos that were brought to your attention?

Once we were approximately two weeks into the rehearsal process, I sent an email to the entire company with YouTube links to other documentary materials. I simply stated that it was there for anyone who wanted to watch them. It was material that I had found and viewed myself as part of

my research so I wanted to pass it on to the company, but I also did not want to take up more of our precious rehearsal time. So, by letting them watch on their own time at their own pace it freed up the potential time it would have used up during rehearsals. The question that I asked myself was, ‘if I make material available so that the acting company did not have to go looking for content themselves, how many would actually watch the documentaries?’ I was very curious as to how many of the actors would take the time to watch the videos since they would have been busy with course work, and at this point in rehearsals they may not want to spend more time on additional research. I was pleasantly surprised to find that nine said they did watch the other videos and found them helpful, with three stating that they did not watch the additional videos at all, and only one stating that they did watch the additional videos but found them to be of no help.

8. *What is your experience with the plays by William Shakespeare? What Shakespeare plays have you seen or read? If applicable, what Shakespeare plays have you been in?*

Similar to the Audience questionnaire, I wanted to know how familiar with *Henry V* the Acting company was, and by extension how familiar they were with Shakespeare’s plays in general. My assumption, as was with our audience, was that they would not have been familiar with *Henry V* at all, and that their interaction with Shakespeare would be limited.

Of the thirteen submitted questionnaires, five answered that this was their first Shakespeare production, another five said that they had performed in one previous Shakespeare production, and the remaining three had performed in more than one. *Henry V* is the first Shakespeare production that Greystone Theatre has presented since they produced *Henry IV Part 1* in 2012, so none of the students involved in *Henry V* were around the department at the time of the earlier *Henry IV* production, and therefore could not have been part of the 2012 cast. The current fourth-year acting students along with one of the third-year acting students put on a condensed version of *Macbeth*

in December of 2017 while they were third- and second-year acting students. As a result, I was not surprised to see *Macbeth* turn up in the list of plays that some of the students had performed in. The complete list includes *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (twice), *Measure for Measure* (a surprise to me), *Macbeth* (thrice), and *Hamlet*. However, two of the participants who stated they had been in more than one Shakespeare production did not list which ones those were.

In the space provided for participants to list which plays they have seen or read there were a great number of the plays' titles supplied. Some could be considered the 'usual suspects' (*Hamlet*, *Macbeth*, *Romeo and Juliet*), and no doubt those who have taken a Shakespeare English class at the University level will have had their scope widened more recently. However, there were still a few surprises: *All's Well That Ends Well*, *Cymbeline*, *Coriolanus*, and one of the students even listed all three parts of *Henry VI*. Amongst the thirteen responses provided there were twenty-seven plays listed by name, with one questionnaire stating "Most of them in some capacity," and another saying "Many," so the number of Shakespeare plays read and/or seen may even be higher. Given that all those plays were covered by only thirteen questionnaires, I was pleasantly surprised to see such a broad knowledge base of Shakespeare's plays within the cast.

Comparatively, most professional productions that I have been a part of have had one or two cast members who are appearing in their first Shakespeare production (or productions if it is a repertory theatre company), with the bulk of the cast appearing in anywhere from their third production to perhaps their twentieth or more. For myself personally, *Henry V* was my thirty-first Shakespeare production covering twenty-four of Shakespeare's plays. So, there was a far lower level of expertise in this production of *Henry V*, as was expected, although the well-read nature of the cast and their enthusiasm for the playwright appears to have helped make up for the lack of practical experience.

Final Thoughts

As I come to the end of my graduate work, when revisiting the title of my thesis, ‘Historical Research Informing Artistic Decisions’, I find myself attempting to conclude whether the work and research that I have conducted over this time has been successful or not. Within that contemplation I find that there are two parts in how I must consider that work: my own personal practice as a theatre artist, and the rehearsal and production process that I assembled in producing Shakespeare’s *Henry V*.

As far as my personal practice is concerned, I can say with great authority that this work has been a tremendous success. Not only has my graduate studies resulted in what I would consider a far more detailed production of *Henry V* than if I had produced the play without the benefit of the research that I conducted, but I now have different methodologies in which I can build upon and am now aware of other resources that I did not have prior knowledge of before beginning my studies: more tools for my tool belt, as a mentor of mine would say. So, in that regard, the work and research completed did in fact conclude with the result that I had hoped for.

When considering the rehearsal and production process, I find that I cannot come to a conclusion as definitive as that when considering my personal practice as a theatre artist. As I highlighted in the beginning of the Assessment Chapter, there were many benefits to producing *Henry V* as part of the Greystone Theatre season, and I do think the production was without a doubt better for it. However, as I also mentioned earlier, the rehearsal process was not similar to that of a professional theatre production in terms of available hours and scheduling. In addition, the student’s primary responsibilities are to their university courses and they are not able to concentrate solely on the production as if it were their fulltime occupation. As a result, I was not able to implement certain ideas simply because we did not have the time to include them (i.e. a far

more extended and involved research period), or I had to proceed with a modified version of an idea. Additionally, the majority of the actors have not had professional theatre experience, and none of them had taken part in a professional Shakespeare production before. And while I attempted to create a rehearsal process that is similar to that of a professional environment so that they are prepared for work beyond the university setting, the undergraduates have no point of reference to note the differences between the creative process that we used for *Henry V* and that of a ‘normal’ or more common professional Shakespeare process. Therefore, when seeking feedback from the acting company I could only ask the actors if they found certain elements of the rehearsal process helpful and not whether they preferred those elements in comparison to those of a professional Shakespeare rehearsal process.

In the end, I believe that I have *begun* to create an alternative rehearsal process, one that specifically includes more historical research in its early stages. It is a process that currently asks each company member to participate in a group research project, and includes consulting a minimum of three historical references or sources when researching a subject (person or event), and when possible three references or sources about the subject that were written or created at different points in time; identifying whether or not there has been a shift in opinion is extremely beneficial when portraying historical figures or events. Understanding the point of view of when a play was written is also helpful since it can help a company of actors grasp and understand why events or characters are being portrayed in a certain light.

Ultimately, no production of *Henry V* can claim to be completely accurate in its presentation of the events portrayed in the story. Each individual production will, in some way, reflect the time in which it is produced; this is true even of those productions set in the time period in which the events actually happened. As discussed earlier, all three contemporary film

adaptations of *Henry V* are noticeably different from one another and yet they are all set in the early fifteenth century. The Greystone production is no exception. The strongest example would be in the portrayal of Katherine during the play's final scene. Although the Treaty of Troyes took place in 1420, a time in which women were restricted by societal norms in a way very different than now, it was important to me that Katherine was not portrayed simply as a pawn that Henry could easily claim as his own. As a result, Katherine (played by Crystal Poniewozik) had a great deal more of her own agency, especially as the scene went on, than has traditionally been played. Those choices were no doubt influenced by the fact that we are living in a time of greater social awareness, and theatre artists are becoming more attuned to the fact that what is presented on stage will be examined with a contemporary eye whether the events take place in the present or not.

There were multiple moments in the production where research informed the decisions we made; two examples specifically relating to Henry are his piety and his scar. As for Henry's devotion to his God, the conclusion that I came to regarding Henry's faith allowed me to quickly make a decision on how to play Henry when he speaks of God. There was no question in my mind that Henry was sincere when he spoke of God, so whenever an opportunity presented itself I would either look up to God when Henry spoke of him/her/it, or at the very least make a quick reference to God with a hand gesture. At times, it was a matter of simply pointing skyward as I said the word "God". That is not to say that Henry did not have doubts throughout the campaign about whether he was doing God's work, but it was never a doubt about his belief in God.

While Henry's faith was something very internal that I attempted to give some kind of physical action to, the scar on Henry's face was very much the opposite: something external that affected the playing of a scene. As part of the design, I had decided very early in the process that I wanted Henry to have the wound he received from the Battle of Shrewsbury (1403) in our *Henry*

V. I was not concerned in making it appear like the result of an arrow wound specifically, but the scar itself and its location was important. It may seem like a minor detail, but it paid huge dividends in the final scene with Katherine. Henry makes three specific references to his face or how he looks while talking to her. By having Henry's scar represented, it resulted in the character being much more self-conscious than is usually portrayed in the wooing scene, and helped build a contrast between what Henry is good at (leading his men at a time of war) and what he is not (interacting with a lady of high social standing). The scene then provides an opportunity to finish the production on a note unlike the rest of the play for the character of Henry, I dare say a comedic note, which then allows the final Chorus speech to undercut the mood by reminding, or informing, the audience that all of this was for naught since Henry VI became king at nine months old and lost all that was gained during Henry V's reign. Although, as Keith Dockray reminds us, "it took the French more than twenty-seven years to recover what Henry V had conquered in less than seven."¹⁴⁹

The students in the cast also brought various details to their characters. Michael Martin, who played multiple characters, was very interested in the fact that Charles VI was frequented with bouts of madness, which resulted in his fear of being made of glass. Michael was able to inject moments of indecision and self-doubt, which then gave the other actors playing members of the French court something to react to. On the English side of the story, by inserting the Duke of York much earlier in the play we were able to have both York (Emily Pickett) and his brother, the Earl of Cambridge (Adam Tweidt), interact with one another before Cambridge is sentenced to death for his act of treason. This moment had its payoff in the scene immediately before the Battle of Agincourt, in that it gave York's request to lead the vanguard a very specific reason.

¹⁴⁹ Dockray, *Henry V*, 75.

Some of the design elements were also influenced by the research that we conducted. By setting the action in the time period in which the events happened, the costumes were obviously going to be very accurate, but one detail we made a point of adding was that all English soldiers were required to wear the cross of St. George. Not only was this historically accurate, but it also gave the audience a clear visual marker if they happened to become confused as to who was fighting on which side of the conflict. The design of the fight choreography was also informed by our goal to represent the time period as accurately as we could. Jordie Richardson, a recent U of S Drama graduate, was able to not only supply weapons that fit the action but he also created fights that included events that were drawn from the chronicles, while ensuring the fighting styles were of the medieval period.

Where this particular production leaves its unique mark, and where the historical research played its largest role, is the use of King Henry's Chaplain in place of the Bishop of Ely, and the Chaplain's dramatic relationship with the play's Chorus. One of the most interesting things that I did not have prior knowledge of before my studies began was the existence of the anonymous *Gesta Henrici Quinti* (as discussed in the first chapter), and that the Chaplain who wrote it, whoever he was, was present during Henry's campaign of 1415. This led me to consider how stories are passed down from generation to generation and how we are reliant upon those that recorded such events in order to know what happened, as biased as that may be. Since the Chorus is narrating and helping to shape the story of King Henry V, I wanted to create a link between how the Chorus would have potentially come across that information and how they would then relate that information to an audience. Therefore, I inserted the King's Chaplain as a character to replace the Bishop of Ely (who only appears in the play's opening scenes in London), and had the Chaplain (Henry Zhang) as present as I could throughout the play, recording the events as they happened

into a journal that he always had on hand. The Chorus (Paige Francoeur) also had an older, more broken-down copy of the journal suggesting that it is the Chaplain's version of events that the Chorus is building the story upon.

The implication is not that Shakespeare's play is a historically accurate account of what happened in 1415 (or the agreement of the Treaty of Troyes in 1420), but it hopefully addresses the notion of how stories are passed down and draws attention to the fact that we were telling a story in 2018 based on a play text written many years prior to that, that was in turn inspired by accounts of the events, written many years before the play, from the perspective of one that was there. Highlighting the fact that we rely on those who recorded history in order to tell stories today seemed an appropriate artistic choice given the nature of how this production was brought to fruition and the focus of my graduate studies.

My favourite comment from the audience survey was in direct response to the production's final moment; the Chorus placing their copy of the journal into the hands of the Chaplain. "The Chorus' book being the priest's book as well was the craziest reveal of my life. Had me seriously shook." A bit hyperbolic to be sure, but it was reassuring to know that the moment did not go by unnoticed.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: An Overview of the History Play as a genre

Given the popularity and prominence of William Shakespeare, it can be easy to forget that he was not the only playwright writing history plays. Nor did he begin the popular genre which enjoyed its height during the late years of Elizabeth I's reign; Henry V, Richard III, and King John all had theatrical incarnations before Shakespeare wrote his plays regarding those same kings. As to the beginning of the 'History' genre, the two plays that paved the way, so to speak, are John Bale's *King Johan*, and *Gorboduc* by Thomas Norton and Thomas Sackville.

Believed to be originally written in 1538, and then later revised when Elizabeth I came to power, *King Johan* is very much in the form of a morality play. However, what makes it a play of note, is that it sets an English monarch at the centre of its story and uses the conflict between King John and the Roman Catholic Church to address the similar conflicts that England was dealing with at the time of the play's composition. That is with England breaking away from the Roman Catholic Church and Henry VIII declaring himself as the head of the Church of England. The revisions that were later made spoke to the friction which the Protestant Elizabeth was having with Rome once she came to the throne. *Gorboduc*, written in 1561, then takes another step towards what we know as the Elizabethan History play. While *Gorboduc* does not place a former English monarch at its centre, it does deal with the politics of succession (a recurring theme in later History plays), while introducing a plot that evokes the later *King Lear*: a questionable division of the kingdom with horrifying results. *Gorboduc* is a play, like *King Johan*, that is born of the morality tradition, and is also important since it is a verse play that goes against the traditional rhyming style of its time. The play is often held up as an example of the transition to blank verse.

Around the same time as the second printing of Raphael Holinshed's *Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland* in 1587, the major wave of English History plays begins. Some plays may have been performed before the second printing, with the popularity of the plays resulting in Holinshed's *Chronicles* receiving a second print, or it could very well have been the opposite, with the printing of a second edition leading to an increase in History plays. It should also be mentioned that the Spanish Armada failed in its attempt to attack England in 1588, which some believe may have fed the nationalist ego of the English at that time, and the History play rode that wave of pride into the 1590s. The anonymous play, *The Famous Victories of Henry the Fifth*, could easily have preceded 1587, but other non-Shakespeare Histories that most certainly followed 1587 were *Edward II* by Christopher Marlowe, *The Battle of Alcazar* and *Edward I* by George Peele, *The Troublesome Reign of King John* (possibly George Peele), the two parts of *Edward IV* by Thomas Heywood, *Owen Tudor* (now lost) by Michael Drayton, Richard Hathway, Anthony Munday, and Robert Wilson, as well as the anonymous plays *Woodstock*, *Edmund Ironside*, *Edward III* (possibly in-part by Shakespeare), *The Life and Death of Jack Straw* (attributed by some to George Peele), and *The True Tragedy of Richard III*. The exact dates of first performance can be difficult to confirm but given the years that are listed on the title pages of the printed quartos for these plays, what does become clear is that from the mid-1580s until Elizabeth's death in 1603, Elizabethan theatre audiences were able to watch a great deal of their country's history portrayed on stage. Another History play that will be talked about later in this section is *Sir John Oldcastle Part 1* written by Drayton, Hathway, Munday, and Wilson (the same team who had worked on *Owen Tudor*). Part 2 of the play has either since been lost, or its commission was never fulfilled.

Shakespeare had an immense impact on the History play genre, and by the time the Lord Chamberlain's Men staged *Henry V* in 1599, Shakespeare had written, or had a major hand in, at least nine English History plays. Additionally, there is a great deal of scholarship on Shakespeare's potential hand in other plays. As mentioned, there are some who suggest Shakespeare was involved in writing at least a portion of *Edward III*, and some also believe that he wrote *Famous Victories* as what can be described as a first draft of his later *Henry* plays. All that to say, he may have had more influence on the genre than at first glance. The History plays were first grouped together in the First Folio of 1623, being printed in the chronological order of their historical events. The order of their composition is quite different, starting with the three *Henry VI* plays and concluding his first tetralogy with *Richard III*. Shakespeare's own take on John then appears to be next, with *King John*, before concluding with his second tetralogy of *Richard II*, *1 Henry IV*, *2 Henry IV*, and finally *Henry V* (although, some scholars place *King John* after *Richard II*). In the twilight of his career, Shakespeare then collaborated with John Fletcher to write the final History play that appears in the First Folio, *Henry VIII or All Is True*, which had its first performance in 1613.

What I currently find most interesting about the *Henry VI* plays is the discussion about their composition. The potential co-authorship of Shakespeare with other playwrights, while interesting, is not the reason why I mention the authorship of these plays; it is because of the order in which they are now believed to have been written. It is now widely thought that what we know as *2 Henry VI* and *3 Henry VI* were in fact written as a two-part story, each originally appearing, although possibly as corrupted texts, as *The First Part of the Contention Betwixt the Two Famous Houses of Yorke and Lancaster*, and *The True Tragedie of Richard Duke of Yorke*, with what we regard as *1 Henry VI* being added as a prequel shortly after the other two plays had appeared on

stage.¹⁵⁰ In Henslowe's diary, there is a record for a *Henry VI* play,¹⁵¹ and some have used this entry to argue that, given the success of the two existing *Henry VI* plays, the Lord Strange's Men were commissioned to add another. This is noteworthy given that a number of History or Chronicle plays were being created in two parts, and it suggests the possibility that Shakespeare was participating in a trend. This begins with Marlowe's *Tamburlaine the Great*, written in the late 1580s (which is not itself considered a History play), which is followed by the two-part story of Henry VI's reign, later expanded to three plays. Those, in turn, were followed by the two parts of *The Troublesome Reign of King John*, Shakespeare's *Henry IV* plays, Thomas Heywood's two-part plays *Edward IV* and *If You Know Not Me You Know Nobody (The Troubles of Queen Elizabeth)*, and not to be left out, the Huntington plays: *The Downfall* and *The Death of Robert Earl of Huntington* by Anthony Munday and Henry Chettle.

Shakespeare's History plays then give way to his great 'historical' tragedies (*King Lear*, *Macbeth*), and his historical view shifts to both Rome and Greece, where he follows up *Julius Caesar* with *Troilus and Cressida*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, *Coriolanus*, *Timon of Athens*, and the multi-categorical, *Cymbeline*. There have been many books published about Shakespeare's History plays as a unit, but there are also those that discuss his Roman plays as part of his Histories, despite the fact that they are categorized within the Tragedies.¹⁵² It is following all of these plays from the Folio that Shakespeare makes his final visit to the History genre with the previously mentioned *Henry VIII*, co-written with Fletcher.

¹⁵⁰ Gary Taylor, "Shakespeare and Others: The Authorship of *Henry the Sixth, Part One*," *Medieval & Renaissance Drama in England* 7, (January 1995): 145-205.

¹⁵¹ R.A. Foakes and R.T. Rickert, ed., *Henslowe's Diary* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961), 16.

¹⁵² See the English Chapter of this thesis, 'Literary Criticism on Shakespeare's History Plays' section.

There are also chronicle plays that were performed that had historical figures as their main focus, as opposed to the reigning monarch. Some examples include: *Sir Thomas More* by Anthony Munday, Henry Chettle, Thomas Dekker, Thomas Heywood, and possibly William Shakespeare; *Life of Cardinal Wolsey* by Henry Chettle; and the anonymous *Thomas Lord Cromwell*. Some additional History plays that appeared during King James' reign include *When You See Me You Know Me* by Samuel Rowley (dealing with Henry VIII), and the previously mentioned *If You Know Not Me You Know Nobody* by Heywood. By looking at the number of History plays produced after James came to the throne in 1603, it is clear that the English History play was in decline.

Other playwrights also used Roman historical figures for their plays, including: *The Tragedie of Cleopatra* by Samuel Daniel (1593); an anonymous *Tragedy of Caesar and Pompey* (1595), also referred to as *Caesar's Revenge*, followed years later in the Jacobean period by George Chapman's own *Caesar and Pompey* (1605); William Alexander's *Julius Caesar* (1604), published as part of *The Monarchick Tragedies*; and two more plays between 1626 and 1628, *Cleopatra, Queen of Egypt* and *Julia Agrippina, Empress of Rome*, both written by Thomas May.

Although Shakespeare was then finished with the genre, as well as with playwriting altogether, by 1613, a few more History plays did appear on the stages of England. Middleton's *Hengist, King of Kent* (1618), and *Sir John van Olden Barnaveit* (1619) by Fletcher and Philip Massinger, appeared about the same time, and another King John play, Robert Davenport's *King John and Matilda*, is dated between 1628 to 1629. Although he never completed the play, and therefore it was never performed, Ben Jonson had started to write, and had mapped out, *Mortimer His Fall*. The play, dealing with the same historical characters as Marlowe's *Edward II*, was most likely being written in the late 1630s (no later than 1637 when Jonson died), and was published in

its unfinished form in 1641. John Ford's *Perkin Warbeck*, which was published in 1634, is considered to be the last complete English History play. In his article, "The End of the English History Play in *Perkin Warbeck*," Miles Taylor proposes why he believes *Perkin Warbeck* is the last play of its kind and gives great insight into the transition of how history was viewed, and how historiography was changing under King James I. Taylor's general description of why the History play declined is that "historiography engendered a crisis for historical drama." And as a result, "a consequent rift between historiography and imaginative literature grew ever wider, the historical dramatist no longer could satisfy the demands of either of his roles; he could be neither a true historian nor an effective dramatist."¹⁵³ This shift in how History was perceived during this point in the Renaissance, and the shift in historiography, surfaces multiple times throughout the criticism on History plays.

I have mentioned many plays thus far, and there are still others that I have elected to leave out of this summary if only to avoid going on for an even greater length. For the plays that I have mentioned that were not covered during the course work of my graduate studies, I am indebted to *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare's History Plays*, edited by Michael Hattaway, for a detailed chronology,¹⁵⁴ as well as Elihu Pearlman's *William Shakespeare: The History Plays*, for a few additional titles not mentioned by Hattaway.¹⁵⁵

¹⁵³ Miles Taylor, "The End of the English History Play in *Perkin Warbeck*," *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 48, no. 2 (Spring 2008): 395.

¹⁵⁴ Michael Hattaway, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare's History Plays* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), xv-xvii.

¹⁵⁵ Elihu Pearlman, *William Shakespeare: The History Plays* (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1992), xi.

Appendix B: Henry in *The Famous Victories*, *Sir John Oldcastle* and *The Shoemaker's Holiday*

Henry as a character is most often associated with Shakespeare's plays, and he certainly takes centre stage with *Henry V*. Yet these are not the only Elizabethan plays in which Henry appears. Two instances seem to be in response to Shakespeare's plays, and the other certainly came before them and could have been a potential if not probable source; the previously mentioned anonymous play, *The Famous Victories of Henry the Fifth*. The other two are Thomas Dekker's *The Shoemaker's Holiday*, and *Sir John Oldcastle Part 1* by Michael Drayton, Richard Hathway, Anthony Munday, and Robert Wilson.

The Shoemaker's Holiday (or *The Gentle Craft*) is the less important portrayal of the group, but I have included it because of when it first appeared on London stages. The King of *The Shoemaker's Holiday* is never specifically identified, and given some of the individuals that appear in the play, he technically should be Henry VI, Henry V's son, who is the King at the time of the story's events. However, given some of the passages in the play, the entry in Henslowe's diary,¹⁵⁶ and the play's presentation for Elizabeth I on New Year's Day 1600,¹⁵⁷ months after Shakespeare's *Henry V* first appeared at the new Globe Theatre, it is widely accepted that the King of Dekker's play is King Henry V. What textual support is there for such a claim? There are two specific sections to which scholars have drawn attention. In the play's eighth scene, Dodger reports news from the war in France, and says,

Five long hours
Both armies fought together; at the length
The lot of victory fell on our sides.
Twelve thousand of the Frenchman that day died,

¹⁵⁶ Foakes and Rickert, *Henslowe's Diary*, 122. Referred to as *The Gentle Craft*.

¹⁵⁷ Thomas Dekker, *The Shoemaker's Holiday*, ed. Jonathan Gil Harris (London: Methuen Drama, 2008), xxvi.

Four thousand English, and no man of name
But Captain Hyam and young Ardington.
Sc. 8 (5-10)

The ratio between the French and English numbers is one detail to note, as is the phrase “no man of name,” which evokes Shakespeare’s line in *Henry V*, “None else of name” (IV.viii.106), when Henry is reading the number of the English dead. The other textual clue, is a reference to tennis balls in the final scene of *The Shoemaker’s Holiday* (Sc. 21.23-24), which may be another allusion to Shakespeare’s *Henry V*, or possibly to popular folklore, with the King receiving tennis balls as a slight from the Dauphin of France (I.ii.255-311). Additionally, Crispin was the patron saint of shoemakers, so relating the King of Dekker’s play to the English King who won victory at Agincourt on St. Crispin’s day, does have its thematic advantages. However, as stated earlier, the King is never identified, and in *The Shoemaker’s Holiday* he is a supporting character who appears as a type of deus-ex-machina to resolve the romantic storyline at the end of the play. Therefore, the unnamed monarch of *The Shoemaker’s Holiday* cannot be considered a major literary reference for Henry V.

The multi-authored *Sir John Oldcastle*, on the other hand, is another matter altogether. Despite being included in the Third and Fourth Folios of Shakespeare’s collected plays, there is no indication that William Shakespeare had any hand in writing *Oldcastle*. If anything, the play was a response to Shakespeare’s *Henry IV* plays, and his portrayal of John Falstaff, whose name had been added to the text as a substitution for John Oldcastle. Chronologically, that certainly makes sense, given that *Oldcastle Part 1* was printed in 1600. One must need to look no further than the play’s prologue to see that Drayton et al were addressing how the Lord Cobham, John Oldcastle, had been represented.

It is no pampered glutton we present,

Nor aged counsellor to youthful sins;
But one whose virtues shone above the rest,
A valiant martyr and a virtuous peer,
In whose true faith and loyalty expressed
To his true sovereign and his country's weal,
We strive to pay that tribute of our love
Your favours merit. Let fair truth be graced,
Since forged invention former time defaced.

(Pro.6-14)

But what of Henry, and *his* portrayal in the play? When the action of *Oldcastle* begins, Henry is already king, so there is no re-creation of his change of character: he is already the mighty monarch who commands respect. He appears in six scenes before he makes his way across the channel to France, his final appearance being the scene with the Southampton Plot conspirators. Interestingly, in *Oldcastle*, it is Sir John Oldcastle himself who becomes aware of the assassination attempt and brings it to King Henry's attention, going against historical consensus that it was Edmund Mortimer, the fifth Earl of March, who brought the plan to the King's attention, even though it was Mortimer himself whom the conspirators wanted to place on the throne. One of the more interesting scenes, is when Henry, while preparing to deal with the rebels in Ficket field, disguises himself. It is interesting not only because the king is in disguise, a recurring theme in many history plays including the Henry of Shakespeare's *Henry V*, but also because when Henry is being robbed by the unknowing parson, John of Wrotham, Henry recalls his antics with Falstaff in an aside.

Just the proverb; one thief robs another. Where the
devil are all my old thieves that were wont to keep this
walk? Falstaff, the villain, is so fat he cannot get on's
horse; but methinks Poins and Peto should be stirring
hereabouts.

(x.51-55)¹⁵⁸

So, even though the play is attempting to set Sir John Oldcastle apart from the image of Falstaff, the playwrights still have included a reference to the fictional 'white-bearded Satan,' benefitting

¹⁵⁸ Michael Drayton, et al. "Sir John Oldcastle Part 1" in *The Oldcastle controversy*, ed. Peter Corbin and Douglas Sedge. (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1991), 91-92.

from the popularity of Shakespeare's creation, so that they can clearly distinguish the two men, Falstaff and Oldcastle, as two different people. Relating this to Henry, by relying on this piece of backstory, it would then imply that this King Henry has the same past as Shakespeare's Henry V.

The final play which must be discussed is the anonymous play *The Famous Victories of Henry the Fifth*. Although some have attempted to make a case that Shakespeare had written this earlier version of the story,¹⁵⁹ it is usually dated in the late 1580s when Shakespeare most likely would have been just arriving in London. The two major reasons why this play is important, is that first, it predates Shakespeare's *Henry* plays, and second, it generally covers the same plotline as does *1 Henry IV*, *2 Henry IV*, and *Henry V*. Yet, even though they are similar in their overall story arcs and share a mix of high and low status characters, there are distinct differences as well. I will mention four specific observations regarding the *Famous Victories* as they relate to the Henry that Shakespeare has created. The first two observations are about similarities in the texts. In both editions of *Famous Victories* that I have read (Seymour M. Pitcher, 1961; Peter Corbin and Douglas Sedge, 1991), and a third that is referenced (J.Q. Adams, 1924), all editors concur that the play is written in prose. Entirely in prose. Shakespeare's plays certainly have their share of prose, especially *1* and *2 Henry IV* with Falstaff speaking prose exclusively, but they are all still predominantly verse plays (although *2 Henry IV* is very close to an equal distribution).¹⁶⁰ Secondly, *Famous Victories* is much shorter in length than any one of Shakespeare's individual *Henry* plays.¹⁶¹ It does not allow much time for the character to develop, and as a result, the

¹⁵⁹ Seymour M. Pitcher, *The Case for Shakespeare's Authorship of The Famous Victories* (New York: State University of New York, 1961).; and Ramon Jimenez, "The Famous Victories of Henry the Fifth--Key to the Authorship Question?" *Shakespeare Oxford Newsletter* 37, no. 2 (Summer 2001): 7.

¹⁶⁰ Alfred Harbage, ed., *William Shakespeare: The Complete Works* (New York: Viking Penguin, 1969), 31.

¹⁶¹ Pitcher, *The Case for Shakespeare's Authorship of The Famous Victories*, 4.

transitions that Henry makes over the course of his journey seem abrupt and rushed; this should come as no surprise, since so much story is being covered with such little text.

The other two moments I want to address are Hal's motivations during two key moments: the robbery plot, and the confrontation between father and son when the Prince comes to court. First, in *Famous Victories*, the robbing of the King's Receivers has already taken place before the action of the play has even begun, and the Prince, along with Ned and Tom, are waiting for Oldcastle to arrive with his portion of the gold. What makes this first scene interesting, is that the Prince is not only part of the robbery, but he is completely complicit in the carrying out of the robbery, and says, "think you not that it was a villainous part of me to rob my father's receivers" (i.7-9). In fact, he goes on to humiliate the receivers whom they have robbed once they arrive to inform the Prince what has happened. This Prince could come as quite a shock for those who have read Shakespeare's *Henry IV* plays prior to this one, since Prince Hal only joins the Gad's Hill robbery in order to play a joke on Falstaff, and eventually pays all the money back with interest.¹⁶² Shakespeare's Prince Hal may be keeping company with some bad individuals, but the Prince in *Famous Victories* is the worst individual of the group.

Finally, looking at the meeting between King and Prince, we see another extreme characterization. The Prince envisions multiple times in the play's first few scenes how he and his friends will benefit when the King eventually dies and the Prince ascends to the throne. In the first scene he states, "I tell you, sirs, and the King, my father, were dead, we would be all kings" (i.78-80), and says again in the play's fifth scene, "But, my lads, if the old King, my father, were dead, we would be all kings" (v.12-13). And in the same scene, after informing Ned, Tom, and Oldcastle that they are going to the court because the King is sick, the Prince states, "for the breath shall be

¹⁶² "The money shall be paid back again with advantage" *1 Henry IV*. Act 2.iv.533-4.

no sooner out of his mouth but I will clap the crown on my head” (v.34-35). The Prince cannot wait to become King and envisions a court where he and his friends will live a life unimpeded. It is a stark contrast to Hal in Shakespeare’s plays, as well as the chronicles that were published at that time. These two moments early in the play help illustrate why the conversion of the Prince of *Famous Victories* seems so abrupt. It takes one speech from Henry IV, ten lines long, for the Prince to then say “My conscience accuseth me” (vi.11), and become penitent. What are we to make of this rapid succession of events? Some have suggested that the quarto that exists of *Famous Victories* is a bad copy, put together by memory. Another theory is that the version of the play that exists is a touring version of the play, so we may not have the complete text. Whatever the case may be, *The Famous Victories of Henry the Fifth* can stand as another example of Shakespeare taking an existing story and applying his skills to it in order to create his own and, I dare say most would agree, improved version of the story: one with more nuance and much greater detail.

Henry V

Written by William Shakespeare / Edited by Skye Brandon

Dramatis Personae

CHORUS PAIGE Francoeur

KING HENRY V, King of England, claimant to the French throne **SKYE Brandon**
Humphrey, Duke of **GLOUCESTER**, younger brother of Henry **COLE Winterhalt**
Edward, Duke of **YORK**, cousin of Henry, older brother of Richard, Earl of Cambridge **EMILY Pickett**
Ralph Neville, Earl of **WESTMORLAND** **MAXWELL Folk**

Archbishop of **CANTERBURY** **DREW Mantyka**
King Henry's **CHAPLAIN** **HENRY Zhang**

Richard, Earl of **CAMBRIDGE**, traitor, younger brother to the Duke of York **ADAM Tweidt**
Henry, Lord **SCROOP** of Masham, traitor **GARRETT Gizen**
Sir Thomas GREY, traitor **NICHOLAS Porrelli**

PISTOL KODY Farrow
NYM DANOVA Dickson
BARDOLPH MICHAEL Martin
BOY KATIE Blackburn-Dust
HOSTESS (Mistress Quickly), now Pistol's wife **JULIA Opdahl**

Sir Thomas ERPINGHAM MICHAEL Martin
Captain GOWER, an Englishman **BOBBI-LEE Jones**
Captain FLUELLEN, a Welshman **DREW Mantyka**
Captain MACMORRIS, an Irishman **ADAM Tweidt**
Captain JAMY, a Scotsman **TAMARA Schaan**
John BATES, a soldier **JULIA Opdahl**
Michael WILLIAMS, a soldier **CHRISTOPHER Krug-Iron**

Charles VI, **KING** of France **MICHAEL Martin**
Isabel, **QUEEN** of France **TAMARA Schaan**
Louis the DAUPHIN, King Charles' son and heir **GARRETT Gizen**
KATHERINE, King Charles' daughter **CRYSTAL Poniewozik**
ALICE, Katherine's lady-in-waiting **EMILY Heinek**
The CONSTABLE of France **CHRISTOPHER Krug-Iron**
Duke of ORLEANS **SEAN Savoy**
Lord RAMBURES **DANOVA Dickson**
MONTJOY, French Ambassador **MAX Perez**
Le Fer, a French Soldier taken prisoner **CRYSTAL Poniewozik**
Duke of BURGUNDY **ADAM Tweidt**
Governor of Harfleur **JULIA Opdahl**
French Courtier/French Soldier **NICHOLAS Porrelli**

Part One

ACT I

CHORUS

O for a Muse of fire, that would ascend
The brightest heaven of invention,
A kingdom for a stage, princes to act
And monarchs to behold the swelling scene!
Then should the warlike Harry, like himself,
Assume the port of Mars; and at his heels,
Leash'd in like hounds, should famine, sword and fire
Crouch for employment. But pardon, and gentles all,
The flat unraised spirits that have dared
On this unworthy scaffold to bring forth
So great an object: can this cockpit hold
The vasty fields of France? or may we cram
Within this wooden O the very casques
That did affright the air at Agincourt?
O, pardon! since a crooked figure may
Attest in little place a million;
And let us, ciphers to this great accompt,
On your imaginary forces work.
Suppose within the girdle of these walls
Are now confined two mighty monarchies,
Whose high upreared and abutting fronts
The perilous narrow ocean parts asunder:
Piece out our imperfections with your thoughts;
Into a thousand parts divide one man,
And make imaginary puissance;
Think when we talk of horses, that you see them
Printing their proud hoofs i' the receiving earth;
For 'tis your thoughts that now must deck our kings,
Carry them here and there; jumping o'er times,
Turning the accomplishment of many years
Into an hour-glass: for the which supply,
Admit me Chorus to this history;
Who prologue-like your humble patience pray,
Gently to hear, kindly to judge, our play.

SCENE I. CUT.¹⁶³

¹⁶³ The opening scene does not appear in the Quarto version of the play, and there is a history of cutting the scene in productions. Historically, the church did not have to persuade Henry. If anything, Henry had to persuade the church to support him.

SCENE II.

Projection slide of the text: 1415 LONDON

Enter KING HENRY V, GLOUCESTER, YORK,¹⁶⁴ WESTMORLAND, and the King's CHAPLAIN

KING HENRY V

Brother Gloucester,
Where is my gracious Lord of Canterbury?

GLOUCESTER

Not here in presence.

KING HENRY V

Send for him, good brother.

GLOUCESTER

Shall we call in the French ambassador?

KING HENRY V

Not yet, good brother: we would be resolved,
Before we hear him, of some things of weight
That task our thoughts, concerning us and France.

Enter the ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

CANTERBURY

God and his angels guard your sacred throne
And make you long become it!

KING HENRY V

Sure, we thank you.

My learned lord, we pray you to proceed
And justly and religiously unfold
Why the law Salique that they have in France
Or should, or should not, bar us in our claim:
And God forbid, my dear and faithful lord,
That you should fashion, wrest, or bow your reading,
Or nicely charge your understanding soul
With opening titles miscreate, whose right
Suits not in native colours with the truth;
For God doth know how many now in health
Shall drop their blood in approbation
Of what your reverence shall incite us to.
Therefore take heed how you impawn our person,

¹⁶⁴ I have introduced the Duke of York much earlier than in the original text. York is a cousin of King Henry and the same person as Aumerle in *Richard II*.

How you awake our sleeping sword of war:
We charge you, in the name of God, take heed.

CANTERBURY ¹⁶⁵

Then hear me, gracious sovereign. There is no bar
To make against your highness' claim to France
But this, which they produce from Pharamond,
'In terram Salicam mulieres ne succedant:'
'No woman shall succeed in Salique land:'
Which Salique land the French unjustly gloze
To be the realm of France, and Pharamond
The founder of this law and female bar.
Yet their own authors faithfully affirm
That the land Salique is in Germany,
Between the floods of Sala and of Elbe;
Where Charles the Great, having subdued the Saxons,
There left behind and settled certain French;
Who, holding in disdain the German women
For some dishonest manners of their life,
Establish'd then this law; to wit, no female
Should be inheritrix in Salique land:
Which Salique, as I said, 'twixt Elbe and Sala,
Is at this day in Germany call'd Meisen.
Then doth it well appear that Salique law
Was not devised for the realm of France.
So that, as clear as is the sun, 'tis just
To hold in right and title of the female:
So do the kings of France unto this day;
Howbeit they would hold up this Salique law
To bar your highness claiming from the female,
And rather choose to hide them in a net
Than amply to imbar their crooked titles
Usurp'd from you and your progenitors.

KING HENRY V

May I with right and conscience make this claim?

CANTERBURY

The sin upon my head, dread sovereign!
For in the book of Numbers is it writ,
When the man dies, let the inheritance
Descend unto the daughter. Gracious lord,
Stand for your own; unwind your bloody flag;
Look back into your mighty ancestors.

¹⁶⁵ This speech of course is much longer, but can become confusing. I have chosen to focus on the Archbishop's attack on Salic law and leave out the many other points that the Archbishop gives to Henry.

CHAPLAIN¹⁶⁶

Awake remembrance of these valiant dead
And with your puissant arm renew their feats.

GLOUCESTER

You are their heir; you sit upon their throne;
The blood and courage that renowned them
Runs in your veins; and my thrice-puissant liege
Is in the very May-morn of his youth,
Ripe for exploits and mighty enterprises.

YORK

Your brother kings and monarchs of the earth
Do all expect that you should rouse yourself,
As did the former lions of your blood.

WESTMORLAND

They know your grace hath cause and means and might;
So hath your highness; never king of England
Had nobles richer and more loyal subjects,
Whose hearts have left their bodies here in England
And lie pavilion'd in the fields of France.

CANTERBURY

O, let their bodies follow, my dear liege,
With blood and sword and fire to win your right;
In aid whereof we of the spirituality
Will raise your highness such a mighty sum
As never did the clergy at one time
Bring in to any of your ancestors.

KING HENRY V

Admit the messenger sent from the Dauphin.¹⁶⁷

WESTMORLAND admits MONTJOY, ambassador of France¹⁶⁸

Now are we well prepared to know the pleasure
Of our fair cousin Dauphin; for we hear
Your greeting is from him, not from the king.

MONTJOY

May't please your majesty to give us leave
Freely to render what we have in charge;

¹⁶⁶ I have essentially replaced the Bishop of Ely with the King's Chaplain. Given that the anonymous Chaplain who wrote the *Gesta Henrici Quinti* had a first-hand account of the French campaign, I have decided to insert the Chaplain as a character in the play, recording the events as they happen.

¹⁶⁷ I have moved the text referring to Henry bending France to his will to after the scene with Montjoy. This way Henry has not yet revealed what his intentions are in regards to France.

¹⁶⁸ Montjoy has an ongoing back-and-forth with Henry throughout the play. This decision to introduce him at this point starts the relationship sooner, and I believe makes it more interesting.

Or shall we sparingly show you far off
The Dauphin's meaning and our embassy?

KING HENRY V

We are no tyrant, but a Christian king;
Unto whose grace our passion is as subject
As are our wretches fetter'd in our prisons:
Therefore with frank and with uncurbed plainness
Tell us the Dauphin's mind.

MONTJOY

Thus, then, in few.
Your highness, lately sending into France,
Did claim some certain dukedoms, in the right
Of your great predecessor, King Edward the Third.
In answer of which claim, the prince our master
Says that you savour too much of your youth,
And bids you be advised there's nought in France
That can be with a nimble galliard won;
You cannot revel into dukedoms there.
He therefore sends you, meeter for your spirit,
This tun of treasure; and, in lieu of this,
Desires you let the dukedoms that you claim
Hear no more of you. This the Dauphin speaks.

KING HENRY V

What treasure, brother?

GLOUCESTER

Tennis-balls, my liege.

KING HENRY V

We are glad the Dauphin is so pleasant with us;
His present and your pains we thank you for:
When we have match'd our rackets to these balls,
We will, in France, by God's grace, play a set
Shall strike his father's crown into the hazard.
Tell him he hath made a match with such a wrangler
That all the courts of France will be disturb'd
With chaces. And we understand him well,
How he comes o'er us with our wilder days,
Not measuring what use we made of them.
We never valued this poor seat of England;
And therefore, living hence, did give ourself
To barbarous licence; as 'tis ever common
That men are merriest when they are from home.
But tell the Dauphin I will keep my state,
Be like a king and show my sail of greatness
When I do rouse me in my throne of France:
For that I have laid by my majesty

And plodded like a man for working-days,
But I will rise there with so full a glory
That I will dazzle all the eyes of France,
Yea, strike the Dauphin blind to look on us.
And tell the pleasant prince this mock of his
Hath turn'd his balls to gun-stones; and his soul
Shall stand sore charged for the wasteful vengeance
That shall fly with them: for many a thousand widows
Shall this his mock mock out of their dear husbands;
Mock mothers from their sons, mock castles down;
And some are yet ungotten and unborn
That shall have cause to curse the Dauphin's scorn.
But this lies all within the will of God,
To whom I do appeal; and in whose name
Tell you the Dauphin I am coming on,
To venge me as I may and to put forth
My rightful hand in a well-hallow'd cause.
So get you hence in peace; and tell the Dauphin
His jest will savour but of shallow wit,
When thousands weep more than did laugh at it.
Convey them with safe conduct. Fare you well.

Exeunt MONTJOY

WESTMORLAND

This was a merry message.

KING HENRY V

We hope to make the sender blush at it.
Now are we well resolved; and, by God's help,
And yours, the noble sinews of our power,
France being ours, we'll bend it to our awe,
Or break it all to pieces.
Therefore let our proportions for these wars
Be soon collected and all things thought upon
That may with reasonable swiftness add
More feathers to our wings; for, God before,
We'll chide this Dauphin at his father's door.

Exeunt.

ACT II

CHORUS¹⁶⁹

¹⁶⁹ This, like many of the following choruses have been split up so that they speak directly to the scene or section that is to follow. As a result, the Chorus appears more frequently as the speeches are spread out.

Now all the youth of England are on fire,
And silken dalliance in the wardrobe lies:
Now thrive the armourers, and honour's thought
Reigns solely in the breast of every man:
They sell the pasture now to buy the horse,
Following the mirror of all Christian kings,
With winged heels, as English Mercuries.
For now sits Expectation in the air,
And hides a sword from hilts unto the point
With crowns imperial, crowns and coronets,
Promised to Harry and his followers.

SCENE I. London. A street.

Enter Corporal NYM and Lieutenant BARDOLPH

BARDOLPH

Well met, Corporal Nym.

NYM

Good morrow, Lieutenant Bardolph.

BARDOLPH

What, are Ancient Pistol and you friends yet?

NYM

For my part, I care not: I say little; but when
time shall serve, there shall be smiles; but that
shall be as it may. I dare not fight; but I will
wink and hold out mine iron: it is a simple one.

BARDOLPH

It is certain, corporal, that he is married to Nell
Quickly: and certainly, she did you wrong; for you
were troth-plight to her.

NYM

I cannot tell: things must be as they may: men may
sleep, and they may have their throats about them at
that time; and some say knives have edges. It must
be as it may: though patience be a tired mare, yet
she will plod. There must be conclusions. Well, I
cannot tell.

Enter PISTOL and HOSTESS

BARDOLPH

Here comes Ancient Pistol and his wife: good
corporal, be patient here. How now, mine host Pistol!

PISTOL

Base tike, call'st thou me host? Now, by this hand,
I swear, I scorn the term; Nor shall my Nell keep lodgers.

HOSTESS

No, by my troth, not long; for we cannot lodge and
board a dozen or fourteen gentlewomen that live
honestly by the prick of their needles, but it will
be thought we keep a bawdy house straight.

NYM and PISTOL draw

O well a day, Lady, if he be not drawn now! we
shall see wilful adultery and murder committed.

BARDOLPH

Good lieutenant! good corporal! offer nothing here.

NYM

Pish!

PISTOL

Pish for thee, Iceland dog! thou prick-ear'd cur of Iceland!

HOSTESS

Good Corporal Nym, show thy valour, and put up your sword.

NYM

Will you shog off? I would have you solus.

PISTOL

'Solus,' egregious dog? O viper vile!
The 'solus' in thy most mervailous face;
The 'solus' in thy teeth, and in thy throat,
And in thy hateful lungs, yea, in thy maw, perdy,
And, which is worse, within thy nasty mouth!
I do retort the 'solus' in thy bowels;
For I can take, and Pistol's cock is up,
And flashing fire will follow.

NYM

I am not Barbason; you cannot conjure me. I have an
humour to knock you indifferently well. If you grow
foul with me, Pistol, I will scour you with my
rapier, as I may, in fair terms: if you would walk
off, I would prick your guts a little, in good
terms, as I may: and that's the humour of it.

PISTOL

O braggart vile and damned furious wight!
The grave doth gape, and doting death is near;
Therefore exhale.

BARDOLPH draws

BARDOLPH

Hear me, hear me what I say: he that strikes the first stroke, I'll run him up to the hilts, as I am a soldier.

Enter the BOY

BOY

Mine host Pistol, you must come to my master, and you, hostess: he is very sick, and would to bed. Good Bardolph, put thy face between his sheets, and do the office of a warming-pan. Faith, he's very ill.

BARDOLPH

Away, you rogue!

Exit BOY

HOSTESS

By my troth, the king has killed his heart. Good husband, come home presently.

Exit HOSTESS

BARDOLPH

Come, shall I make you two friends? We must to France together: why the devil should we keep knives to cut one another's throats?

NYM

You'll pay me the eight shillings I won of you at betting?

PISTOL

Base is the slave that pays.

They draw

BARDOLPH

By this sword, he that makes the first thrust, I'll kill him; by this sword, I will.

PISTOL

Sword is an oath, and oaths must have their course.

BARDOLPH

Corporal Nym, an thou wilt be friends, be friends: an thou wilt not, why, then, be enemies with me too. Prithee, put up.

NYM

I shall have my eight shillings I won of you at betting?

PISTOL

A noble shalt thou have, and present pay;
And liquor likewise will I give to thee,
And friendship shall combine, and brotherhood.
Give me thy hand.

NYM

I shall have my noble?

PISTOL

In cash most justly paid.

NYM

Well, then, that's the humour of't.

Re-enter HOSTESS

HOSTESS

As ever you came of women, come in quickly to Sir John. Ah, poor heart! he is so shaked of a burning quotidian tertian, that it is most lamentable to behold. Sweet men, come to him.

Exit HOSTESS

NYM

The king hath run bad humours on the knight; that's the even of it.

PISTOL

Nym, thou hast spoke the right;
His heart is fractured and corroborate.

NYM

The king is a good king: but it must be as it may;
he passes some humours and careers.

PISTOL

Let us condole the knight; for, lambkins we will live.

Exeunt

SCENE II. Southampton.

CHORUS

The French, advised by good intelligence
Of this most dreadful preparation,
Shake in their fear and with pale policy
Seek to divert the English purposes.
O England! model to thy inward greatness,
Like little body with a mighty heart,

What mightst thou do, that honour would thee do,
 Were all thy children kind and natural!
 But see thy fault! France hath in thee found out
 A nest of hollow bosoms, which he fills
 With treacherous crowns; and three corrupted men,
 One, Richard Earl of Cambridge, and the second,
 Henry Lord Scroop of Masham, and the third,
 Sir Thomas Grey, knight of Northumberland,
 Have, for the gilt of France,--O guilt indeed!
 Confirm'd conspiracy with fearful France;
 And by their hands this grace of kings must die,
 If hell and treason hold their promises,
 Ere he take ship for France, and in Southampton.
 Linger your patience on; and we'll digest
 The abuse of distance; force a play:
 The sum is paid; the traitors are agreed;
 The king is set from London; and the scene
 Is now transported, gentles, to Southampton;
 There is the playhouse now, there must you sit:
 And thence to France shall we convey you safe,
 And bring you back, charming the narrow seas
 To give you gentle pass; for, if we may,
 We'll not offend one stomach with our play.
 But, till the king come forth, and not till then,
 Unto Southampton do we shift our scene.

Enter SCROOP, CAMBRIDGE, and GREY during the CHORUS.

Projection slide of text: SOUTHAMPTON

Then KING HENRY V, GLOUCESTER, YORK¹⁷⁰, WESTMORLAND, and the King's CHAPLAIN¹⁷¹

KING HENRY V

Now sits the wind fair, and we will aboard.
 My Lord of Cambridge, and my kind Lord of Masham,
 And you, my gentle knight, give me your thoughts:
 Think you not that the powers we bear with us
 Will cut their passage through the force of France?

SCROOP

No doubt, my liege, if each man do his best.

¹⁷⁰ The Duke of York is the older brother of the Earl of Cambridge. By having York present from the beginning of the play there is now an opportunity to have the brothers on stage together in this scene, and I believe it can play a part in York's request to lead the vanguard at Agincourt in an attempt to redeem the York family name.

¹⁷¹ I have removed the conversation before Henry's entrance. I do not want the audience to know at this point that Henry has knowledge of the plot.

KING HENRY V

I doubt not that. Cousin of Westmorland,
Enlarge the man committed yesterday,
That rail'd against our person: we consider
it was excess of wine that set him on;
And on his more advice we pardon him.

SCROOP

That's mercy, but too much security:
Let him be punish'd, sovereign, lest example
Breed, by his sufferance, more of such a kind.

KING HENRY V

O, let us yet be merciful.

CAMBRIDGE

So may your highness, and yet punish too.

GREY

Sir,
You show great mercy, if you give him life,
After the taste of much correction.

KING HENRY V

Alas, your too much love and care of me
Are heavy orisons 'gainst this poor wretch!
If little faults, proceeding on distemper,
Shall not be wink'd at, how shall we stretch our eye
When capital crimes, chew'd, swallow'd and digested,
Appear before us? We'll yet enlarge that man,
Though Cambridge, Scroop and Grey, in their dear care
And tender preservation of our person,
Would have him punished. And now to our French causes:
Who are the late commissioners?

CAMBRIDGE

I one, my lord:

Your highness bade me ask for it to-day.

SCROOP

So did you me, my liege.

GREY

And I, my royal sovereign.

KING HENRY V

Then, Richard Earl of Cambridge, there is yours;
There yours, Lord Scroop of Masham; and, sir knight,
Grey of Northumberland, this same is yours:
Read them; and know, I know your worthiness.
My Lord of Westmoreland, and brother Bedford,
We will aboard to night.

Enter FLUELLEN, JAMY, and GOWER behind the three traitors

Why, how now, gentlemen!

What see you in those papers that you lose
So much complexion? Why, what read you there
That hath so cowarded and chased your blood
Out of appearance?

CAMBRIDGE

I do confess my fault;
And do submit me to your highness' mercy.

GREY and SCROOP

To which we all appeal.

KING HENRY V

The mercy that was quick in us but late,
By your own counsel is suppress'd and kill'd:
You must not dare, for shame, to talk of mercy.
See you, my princes, and my noble peers,
These English monsters! My Lord of Cambridge here,
Hath, for a few light crowns, lightly conspired,
And sworn unto the practises of France,
To kill us here in Hampton: to the which
This knight, no less for bounty bound to us
Than Cambridge is, hath likewise sworn. But, O,
What shall I say to thee, Lord Scroop? thou cruel,
Ingrateful, savage and inhuman creature!
Thou that didst bear the key of all my counsels,
That knew'st the very bottom of my soul.
May it be possible, that foreign hire
Could out of thee extract one spark of evil
That might annoy my finger? 'tis so strange,
That, though the truth of it stands off as gross
O, how hast thou with 'jealousy infected
The sweetness of affiance! Show men dutiful,
Why so did'st thou. Seem they grave and learned?
Why so did'st thou. Come they of noble family?
Why so did'st thou. Seem they religious?
Why so did'st thou. I will weep for thee;
For this revolt of thine, methinks, is like
Another fall of man. Their faults are open:
Arrest them to the answer of the law;
And God acquit them of their practises!

WESTMORLAND

I arrest thee of high treason, by the name of
Richard Earl of Cambridge.
I arrest thee of high treason, by the name of
Thomas Grey, knight, of Northumberland.

I arrest thee of high treason, by the name of
Henry Lord Scroop of Masham.

SCROOP

Our purposes God justly hath discover'd;
And I repent my fault more than my death;
Which I beseech your highness to forgive,
Although my body pay the price of it.

KING HENRY V

God quit you in his mercy! Hear your sentence.
You have conspired against our royal person,
Join'd with an enemy proclaim'd and from his coffers
Received the golden earnest of our death;
Wherein you would have sold your king to slaughter.
Touching our person seek we no revenge;
But we our kingdom's safety must so tender,
Whose ruin you have sought, that to her laws
We do deliver you. Get you therefore hence,
Poor miserable wretches, to your death:
The taste whereof, God of his mercy give
You patience to endure, and true repentance
Of all your dear offences! Bear them hence.

Exeunt CAMBRIDGE, SCROOP and GREY, guarded

As he is led off, CAMBRIDGE calling to YORK "Brother York, forgive me, brother..."

Now, lords, for France; the enterprise whereof
Shall be to you, as us, like glorious.
We doubt not of a fair and lucky war,
Since God so graciously hath brought to light
This dangerous treason lurking in our way.
Cheerly to sea; the signs of war advance:
No king of England, if not king of France.

Exeunt

SCENE III. London. Before a tavern.

Projection slide of the text: LONDON

Enter PISTOL, Hostess, NYM, BARDOLPH, and BOY

HOSTESS

Prithee, honey-sweet husband, let me bring thee to Staines.

PISTOL

No; for my manly heart doth yearn.
Bardolph, be blithe: Nym, rouse thy vaunting veins:

Boy, bristle thy courage up; for Falstaff he is dead,
And we must yearn therefore.

BARDOLPH

Would I were with him, wheresome'er he is, either in
heaven or in hell!

HOSTESS

Nay, sure, he's not in hell: he's in Arthur's
bosom, if ever man went to Arthur's bosom. A' made
a finer end and went away an it had been any
christom child; a' parted even just between twelve
and one, even at the turning o' the tide: for after
I saw him fumble with the sheets and play with
flowers and smile upon his fingers' ends, I knew
there was but one way; for his nose was as sharp as
a pen, and a' babbled of green fields. 'How now,
sir John!' quoth I 'what, man! be o' good
cheer.' So a' cried out 'God, God, God!' three or
four times. Now I, to comfort him, bid him a'
should not think of God; I hoped there was no need
to trouble himself with any such thoughts yet. So
a' bade me lay more clothes on his feet: I put my
hand into the bed and felt them, and they were as
cold as any stone; then I felt to his knees, and
they were as cold as any stone, and so upward and
upward, and all was as cold as any stone.

NYM

They say he cried out of sack.

HOSTESS

Ay, that a' did.

BARDOLPH

And of women.

HOSTESS

Nay, that a' did not.

BOY

Yes, that a' did; and said they were devils
incarnate.

HOSTESS

A' could never abide carnation; 'twas a colour he
never liked.

BOY

A' said once, the devil would have him about women.

HOSTESS

A' did in some sort, indeed, handle women; but then
he was rheumatic, and talked of the whore of Babylon.

BOY

Do you not remember, a' saw a flea stick upon
Bardolph's nose, and a' said it was a black soul
burning in hell-fire?

BARDOLPH

Well, the fuel is gone that maintained that fire:
that's all the riches I got in his service.

NYM

Shall we shog? the king will be gone from
Southampton.

PISTOL

Come, let's away. My love, give me thy lips.
Look to my chattels and my movables:
Let senses rule; the word is 'Pitch and Pay:'
Trust none.

PISTOL kisses HOSTESS

BOY

And that's but unwholesome food they say.

PISTOL

Touch her soft mouth, and march.

BARDOLPH

Farewell, hostess.

BARDOLPH kisses her and exits

NYM

I cannot kiss, that is the humour of it; but, adieu.

NYM exits

PISTOL

Let housewifery appear: keep close, I thee command.

HOSTESS

Farewell; adieu.

Exit PISTOL and BOY

CHORUS

Thus with imagined wing our swift scene flies
In motion of no less celerity
Than that of thought. Suppose that you have seen
The well-appointed king at Hampton pier

Embark his royalty; and his brave fleet
With silken streamers the young Phoebus fanning:
Play with your fancies, and in them behold
Upon the hempen tackle ship-boys climbing;
Hear the shrill whistle which doth order give
To sounds confused; behold the threaten sails,
Borne with the invisible and creeping wind,
Draw the huge bottoms through the furrow'd sea,
Breasting the lofty surge: O, do but think
You stand upon the ravage and behold
A city on the inconstant billows dancing;
For so appears this fleet majestic.

SCENE IV. France. The KING'S palace.
Projection slide of text: PARIS

Flourish. Enter the FRENCH KING, the DAUPHIN, the CONSTABLE, and ORLEANS

KING OF FRANCE

Thus comes the English with full power upon us;
And more than carefully it us concerns
To answer royally in our defences.
Therefore, my lord High Constable, you sir,
Along with our Duke of Orleans, make forth,
And you, Prince Dauphin, with all swift dispatch,
To line and new repair our towns of war
With men of courage and with means defendant;
For England his approaches makes as fierce
As waters to the sucking of a gulf.

DAUPHIN

My most redoubted father,
It is most meet we arm us 'gainst the foe;
For peace itself should not so dull a kingdom,
Though war nor no known quarrel were in question,
But that defences, musters, preparations,
Should be maintain'd, assembled and collected,
As were a war in expectation.
Therefore, I say 'tis meet we all go forth
To view the sick and feeble parts of France:
And let us do it with no show of fear;
No, with no more than if we heard that England
Were busied with a Whitsun morris-dance:
For, my good liege, she is so idly king'd,
By a vain, giddy, shallow, humorous youth,
That fear attends her not.

CONSTABLE

O peace, Prince Dauphin!
You are too much mistaken in this king:
Question your grace the late ambassador,
With what great state he heard their embassy,
How well supplied with noble counsellors,
How modest in exception, and withal
How terrible in constant resolution.

DAUPHIN

Well, 'tis not so, my lord high constable.

KING OF FRANCE

Think we King Harry strong;
And, princes, look you strongly arm to meet him.
The kindred of him hath been flesh'd upon us;
And he is bred out of that bloody strain
That haunted us. I say, he is a stem
Of that victorious stock; and let us fear
The native mightiness and fate of him.

Enter MONTJOY¹⁷²

MONTJOY

Ambassadors from Harry King of England
Do crave admittance to your majesty.

KING OF FRANCE

We'll give them present audience. Go, and bring them.

Exeunt MONTJOY

You see this chase is hotly follow'd, friends.

DAUPHIN

Turn head, and stop pursuit; for coward dogs
Most spend their mouths when what they seem to threaten
Runs far before them. Good my sovereign,
Take up the English short, and let them know
Of what a monarchy you are the head.

Re-enter MONTJOY, with GLOUCESTER and WESTMORLAND

KING OF FRANCE

From our brother England?

GLOUCESTER

From him; and thus he greets your majesty.
He wills you, in the name of God Almighty,

¹⁷² Another opportunity to include Montjoy.

That you divest yourself, and lay apart
The borrow'd glories that by gift of heaven,
By law of nature and of nations, 'long
To him and to his heirs; namely, the crown.
He sends you this most memorable line,
In every branch truly demonstrative;
Willing to overlook this pedigree.

GLOUCESTER delivers the paper ¹⁷³

And when you find him evenly derived
From his most famed of famous ancestors,
Edward the Third, he bids you then resign
Your crown and kingdom, indirectly held
From him the native and true challenger.

KING OF FRANCE

Or else what follows?

WESTMORLAND

Bloody constraint; for if you hide the crown
Even in your hearts, there will he rake for it:
Therefore in fierce tempest is he coming,
In thunder and in earthquake, like a Jove,
That, if requiring fail, he will compel.
This is his claim, his threatening and my message;
Unless the Dauphin be in presence here,
To whom expressly I bring greeting too.

KING OF FRANCE

For us, we will consider of this further:
To-morrow shall you bear our full intent
Back to our brother England.

DAUPHIN

For the Dauphin,
I stand here for him: what to him from England?

GLOUCESTER

Scorn and defiance; slight regard, contempt,
And any thing that may not misbecome
The mighty sender, doth he prize you at.
Thus says my king; an' if your father's highness
Do not, in grant of all demands at large,
Sweeten the bitter mock you sent his majesty,
He'll call you to so hot an answer of it,
That caves and wombby vaultages of France
Shall chide your trespass and return your mock
In second accent of his ordnance.

¹⁷³ The same pedigree that the Archbishop will have in his earlier scene with King Henry.

DAUPHIN

Say, if my father render fair return,
It is against my will; for I desire
Nothing but odds with England: to that end,
As matching to his youth and vanity,
I did present him with the Paris balls.

WESTMORLAND

He'll make your Paris Louvre shake for it.

KING OF FRANCE

To-morrow shall you know our mind at full.

GLOUCESTER

Dispatch us with all speed, lest that our king
Come here himself to question our delay;
For he is footed in this land already.

KING OF FRANCE

You shall be soon dispatch's with fair conditions:
A night is but small breath and little pause
To answer matters of this consequence.

Exeunt

ACT III**CHORUS**

Holding due course to Harfleur. Follow, follow:
Grapple your minds to sternage of this navy,
And leave your England, as dead midnight still,
Guarded with grandsires, babies and old women,
Either past or not arrived to pith and puissance;
For who is he, whose chin is but enrich'd
With one appearing hair, that will not follow
These cull'd and choice-drawn cavaliers to France?
Suppose the ambassador from the French comes back;
Tells Harry that the king doth offer him
Katharine his daughter, and with her, to dowry,
Some petty and unprofitable dukedoms.
The offer likes not.
Work, work your thoughts, and therein see a siege;
Behold the ordnance on their carriages,
With fatal mouths gaping on girded Harfleur.

SFX Canon

SCENE I. France.

Projection slide of the text: HARFLEUR

Alarum. Enter KING HENRY, GLOUCESTER, YORK, WESTMORLAND and soldiers (FLUELLEN, GOWER, MACMORRIS and JAMY). The CHAPLAIN is ever present.

KING HENRY V

Once more unto the breach, dear friends, once more;
Or close the wall up with our English dead.
In peace there's nothing so becomes a man
As modest stillness and humility:
But when the blast of war blows in our ears,
Then imitate the action of the tiger;
Stiffen the sinews, summon up the blood,
Disguise fair nature with hard-favour'd rage;
Then lend the eye a terrible aspect;
Let pry through the portage of the head
Like the brass cannon; let the brow o'erwhelm it
As fearfully as doth a galled rock
O'erhang and jutty his confounded base,
Swill'd with the wild and wasteful ocean.
Now set the teeth and stretch the nostril wide,
Hold hard the breath and bend up every spirit
To his full height. On, on, you noblest English.
Whose blood is fet from fathers of war-proof!
Fathers that, like so many Alexanders,
Have in these parts from morn till even fought
And sheathed their swords for lack of argument:
Dishonour not your mothers; now attest
That those whom you call'd fathers did beget you.
Be copy now to men of grosser blood,
And teach them how to war. And you, good yeoman,
Whose limbs were made in England, show us here
The mettle of your pasture; let us swear
That you are worth your breeding; which I doubt not;
For there is none of you so mean and base,
That hath not noble lustre in your eyes.
I see you stand like greyhounds in the slips,
Straining upon the start. The game's afoot:
Follow your spirit, and upon this charge
Cry 'God for Harry, England, and Saint George!'

Exeunt. Alarum, and chambers go off

SCENE II. The same.

Enter NYM, BARDOLPH, PISTOL, and BOY

BARDOLPH

On, on, on, on, on! to the breach, to the breach!

NYM

Pray thee, corporal, stay: the knocks are too hot;
and, for mine own part, I have not a case of lives:
the humour of it is too hot, that is the very
plain-song of it.

PISTOL

The plain-song is most just: for humours do abound:
Knocks go and come; God's vassals drop and die;
And sword and shield,
In bloody field,
Doth win immortal fame.

SFX Canon

BOY

Would I were in an alehouse in London! I would give
all my fame for a pot of ale and safety.

PISTOL

And I.

SFX Canon

If wishes would prevail with me,
My purpose should not fail with me,
But thither would I hie.

BOY

As duly, but not as truly,
As bird doth sing on bough.

Enter FLUELLEN

FLUELLEN

Up to the breach, you dogs! Avaunt, you cullions!

Driving them forward

PISTOL

Be merciful, great duke, to men of mould.
Abate thy rage, abate thy manly rage,
Abate thy rage, great duke!
Good bawcock, bate thy rage; use lenity, sweet chuck!

NYM

These be good humours! your honour wins bad humours.

Exeunt all but BOY

BOY

As young as I am, I have observed these three swashers. I am boy to them all three: but all they three, though they would serve me, could not be man to me; for indeed three such antics do not amount to a man. Bardolph stole a lute-case, bore it twelve leagues, and sold it for three half pence. Nym and Bardolph are sworn brothers in filching, and in Calais they stole a fire-shovel: I knew by that piece of service the men would carry coals. They would have me as familiar with men's pockets as their gloves or their handkerchers: which makes much against my manhood, if I should take from another's pocket to put into mine; for it is plain pocketing up of wrongs. I must leave them, and seek some better service: their villany goes against my weak stomach, and therefore I must cast it up.

Exit

Enter FLUELLEN, and GOWER severally

GOWER

Captain Fluellen, you must come presently to the mines; the Duke of Gloucester would speak with you.

FLUELLEN

To the mines! tell you the duke, it is not so good to come to the mines; for, look you, the mines is not according to the disciplines of the war: the concavities of it is not sufficient; for, look you, the athversary, you may discuss unto the duke, look you, is digt himself four yard under the countermines: by Cheshu, I think a' will plough up all, if there is not better directions.

GOWER

The Duke of Gloucester, to whom the order of the siege is given, is altogether directed by an Irishman, a very valiant gentleman, i' faith.

FLUELLEN

It is Captain Macmorris, is it not?

GOWER

I think it be.

FLUELLEN

By Cheshu, he is an ass, as in the world: I will
verify as much in his beard: be has no more
directions in the true disciplines of the wars, look
you, of the Roman disciplines, than is a puppy-dog.

*Enter MACMORRIS and Captain JAMY*¹⁷⁴

GOWER

Here a' comes; and the Scots captain, Captain Jamy, with him.

FLUELLEN

Captain Jamy is a marvellous falourous gentleman,
that is certain.

JAMY

I say gud-day, Captain Fluellen.

FLUELLEN

God-den to your worship, good Captain James.

GOWER

How now, Captain Macmorris! have you quit the
mines? have the pioneers given o'er?

MACMORRIS

By Chrish, la! tish ill done: the work ish give
over, the trompet sound the retreat. By my hand,
by my hand, tish ill done!

FLUELLEN

Captain Macmorris, I beseech you now, will you
vouchsafe me, look you, a few disputations with you,
as partly touching or concerning the disciplines of
the war, the Roman wars, in the way of argument,
look you, and friendly communication?

JAMY

It sall be vary gud, gud feith, gud captains bath:
and I sall quit you with gud leve, as I may pick
occasion; that sall I, marry.

MACMORRIS

It is no time to discourse, so Chrish save me: the
day is hot, and the weather, and the wars, and the
king, and the dukes: it is no time to discourse. The
town is beseeched, and the trumpet call us to the
breach; and we talk, and, be Chrish, do nothing:
'tis shame for us all: so God sa' me, 'tis shame to

¹⁷⁴ Although I have edited the "Four Captains" scene, I think it is important to include it. The French army has internal conflict, and this scene shows that the English do as well. It is also key in that it shows the English, Irish, Scottish, and Welsh all on the same side, despite their disagreements.

stand still; it is shame, by my hand: and there is throats to be cut, and works to be done; and there ish nothing done, so Chrish sa' me, la!

JAMY

By the mess, ere theise eyes of mine take themselves to slomber, ay'll de gud service, or ay'll lig i' the grund for it.

FLUELLEN

Captain Macmorris, I think, look you, under your correction, there is not many of your nation--

MACMORRIS

Of my nation! What ish my nation? Ish a villain, and a bastard, and a knave, and a rascal. What ish my nation? Who talks of my nation?

FLUELLEN

Look you, if you take the matter otherwise than is meant, Captain Macmorris, peradventure I shall think you do not use me with that affability as in discretion you ought to use me, look you: being as good a man as yourself.

MACMORRIS

I do not know you so good a man as myself: so Chrish save me, I will cut off your head.

GOWER

Gentlemen both, you will mistake each other.

JAMY

A! that's a foul fault.

A parley sounded

GOWER

The town sounds a parley.

FLUELLEN

Captain Macmorris, when there is more better opportunity to be required, look you, I will be so bold as to tell you I know the disciplines of war; and there is an end.

SCENE III. The same. Before the gates.

The Governor on the walls; the English forces below. Enter KING HENRY and his train.

KING HENRY V¹⁷⁵

How yet resolves the governor of the town?
This is the latest parle we will admit;
Therefore to our best mercy give yourselves;
Or like to men proud of destruction
Defy us to our worst: for, as I am a soldier,
A name that in my thoughts becomes me best,
If I begin the battery once again,
I will not leave the half-achieved Harfleur
Till in her ashes she lie buried.
The gates of mercy shall be all shut up,
And the flesh'd soldier, rough and hard of heart,
In liberty of bloody hand shall range
With conscience wide as hell, mowing like grass
Your fresh-fair virgins and your flowering infants.
What is it then to me, if impious war,
Array'd in flames like to the prince of fiends,
Do, with his smirch'd complexion, all fell feats
Enlink'd to waste and desolation?
What is't to me, when you yourselves are cause,
If your pure maidens fall into the hand
Of hot and forcing violation?
What rein can hold licentious wickedness
When down the hill he holds his fierce career?
We may as bootless spend our vain command
Upon the enraged soldiers in their spoil
As send precepts to the leviathan
To come ashore. Therefore, you men of Harfleur,
Take pity of your town and of your people,
Whiles yet my soldiers are in my command;
Whiles yet the cool and temperate wind of grace
O'erblows the filthy and contagious clouds
Of heady murder, spoil and villany.
If not, why, in a moment look to see
The blind and bloody soldier with foul hand
Defile the locks of your shrill-shrieking daughters;
Your fathers taken by the silver beards,
And their most reverend heads dash'd to the walls,
Your naked infants spitted upon pikes,
Whiles the mad mothers with their howls confused
Do break the clouds, as did the wives of Jewry
At Herod's bloody-hunting slaughtermen.

¹⁷⁵ The speech is uncut. It is a moment in the play that is either removed (Olivier's 1944 film) or edited, but it is an important barometer in how King Henry is received by an audience. See Chapter 2 of the written portion of my thesis.

What say you? will you yield, and this avoid,
Or, guilty in defence, be thus destroy'd?

GOVERNOR

Our expectation hath this day an end:
The Dauphin, whom of succors we entreated,
Returns us that his powers are yet not ready
To raise so great a siege. Therefore, great king,
We yield our town and lives to thy soft mercy.
Enter our gates; dispose of us and ours;
For we no longer are defensible.

KING HENRY V

Open your gates. Come, cousin Westmorland,
Go you and enter Harfleur; there remain,
And fortify it strongly 'gainst the French:
Use mercy to them all. For us, dear friends,¹⁷⁶
The winter coming on and sickness growing
Upon our soldiers, we will retire to Calais.
To-night in Harfleur we will be your guest;
To-morrow for the march are we addressed.

Flourish. The King and his train enter the town

SCENE IV. The FRENCH KING's palace.
Projection of the text: PARIS

Enter KATHARINE and ALICE

KATHARINE

Alice, tu as ete en Angleterre, et tu parles bien le langage.

ALICE

Un peu, madame.

KATHARINE

Je te prie, m'enseignez: il faut que j'apprenne a
parler. Comment appelez-vous la main en Anglois?

ALICE

La main? elle est appelee de hand.

KATHARINE

De hand. Et les doigts?

ALICE

¹⁷⁶ By making this part of Henry's speech to all of the soldiers on stage, and not just Westmorland, we can achieve the moment described in the *Gesta* that the decision to march to Calais was not received positively.

Les doigts? ma foi, j'oublie les doigts; mais je me souviendrai. Les doigts? je pense qu'ils sont appeles de fingres; oui, de fingres.

KATHARINE

La main, de hand; les doigts, de fingres. Je pense que je suis le bon ecolier; j'ai gagne deux mots d'Anglois vitemment. Comment appelez-vous les ongles?

ALICE

Les ongles? nous les appelons de nails.

KATHARINE

De nails. Ecoutez; dites-moi, si je parle bien: de hand, de fingres, et de nails.

ALICE

C'est bien dit, madame; il est fort bon Anglois.

KATHARINE

Dites-moi l'Anglois pour le bras.

ALICE

De arm, madame.

KATHARINE

Et le coude?

ALICE

De elbow.

KATHARINE

De elbow. Je m'en fais la repetition de tous les mots que vous m'avez appris des a present.

ALICE

Il est trop difficile, madame, comme je pense.

KATHARINE

Excusez-moi, Alice; ecoutez: de hand, de fingres, de nails, de arma, de bilbow.

ALICE

De elbow, madame.

KATHARINE

O Seigneur Dieu, je m'en oublie! de elbow. Comment appelez-vous le col?

ALICE

De neck, madame.

KATHARINE

De nick. Et le menton?

ALICE

De chin.

KATHARINE

De sin. Le col, de nick; de menton, de sin.

ALICE

Oui. Sauf votre honneur, en verite, vous prononcez les mots aussi droit que les natifs d'Angleterre.

KATHARINE

Je ne doute point d'apprendre, par la grace de Dieu, et en peu de temps.

ALICE

N'avez vous pas deja oublie ce que je vous ai enseigne?

KATHARINE

Non, je reciterai a vous promptement: de hand, de fingres, de mails--

ALICE

De nails, madame.

KATHARINE

De nails, de arm, de ilbow.

ALICE

Sauf votre honneur, de elbow.

KATHARINE

Ainsi dis-je; de elbow, de nick, et de sin. Comment appelez-vous le pied et la robe?

ALICE

De foot, madame; et de coun.

KATHARINE

De foot et de coun! O Seigneur Dieu! ce sont mots de son mauvais, corruptible, gros, et impudique, et non pour les dames d'honneur d'user: je ne voudrais prononcer ces mots devant les seigneurs de France pour tout le monde. Foh! le foot et le coun! Neanmoins, je reciterai une autre fois ma lecon ensemble: de hand, de fingres, de nails, de arm, de elbow, de nick, de sin, de foot, de coun.

ALICE

Excellent, madame!

KATHARINE

C'est assez pour une fois: allons-nous a diner.

SCENE V. The same.

Enter the KING OF FRANCE, the QUEEN OF FRANCE¹⁷⁷, the DAUPHIN, the DUKE OF ORLEANS, and the CONSTABLE of France

The QUEEN ushers KATHARINE and ALICE out of the room, but stays herself

KING OF FRANCE

'Tis certain he hath pass'd the river Somme.

CONSTABLE

And if he be not fought withal, my lord,
Let us not live in France; let us quit all
And give our vineyards to a barbarous people.

ORLEANS

Normans, but bastard Normans, Norman bastards!
Mort de ma vie! if they march along
Unfought withal, but I will sell my dukedom,
To buy a slobbery and a dirty farm
In that nook-shotten isle of Albion.

CONSTABLE

Dieu de batailles! where have they this mettle?
Is not their climate foggy, raw and dull,
On whom, as in despite, the sun looks pale,
Killing their fruit with frowns? Can sodden water,
A drench for sur-rein'd jades, their barley-broth,
Decoct their cold blood to such valiant heat?

DAUPHIN

By faith and honour,
Our madams mock at us, and plainly say
Our mettle is bred out and they will give
Their bodies to the lust of English youth
To new-store France with bastard warriors.

KING OF FRANCE

Where is Montjoy the herald? speed him hence:
Let him greet England with our sharp defiance.
Up, princes! and, with spirit of honour edged
More sharper than your swords, hie to the field.
Charles Delabreth, high constable of France,
Bar Harry England, that sweeps through our land
With pennons painted in the blood of Harfleur:
Rush on his host, as doth the melted snow
Upon the valleys, whose low vassal seat
The Alps doth spit and void his rheum upon:
Go down upon him, you have power enough,

¹⁷⁷ I would like to see the Queen introduced earlier in the play. Historically she is very important to the Treaty of Troyes, so having her have knowledge of events seems beneficial.

CONSTABLE

KING OF FRANCE

DAUPHIN

KING OF FRANCE

Exeunt

Projection of the text: PICARDY

GOWER

FLUELLEN

Enter PISTOL

FLUELLEN

PISTOL

Bardolph, a soldier, firm and sound of heart,
And of buxom valour, hath, by cruel fate,
And giddy Fortune's furious fickle wheel --

FLUELLEN

By your patience, Aunchient Pistol.
Fortune is an excellent moral.

PISTOL

Fortune is Bardolph's foe, and frowns on him;
For he hath stolen a pax, and hanged must a' be:
A damned death!
Therefore, go speak: the duke will hear thy voice:
And let not Bardolph's vital thread be cut
With edge of penny cord and vile reproach:
Speak, captain, for his life, and I will thee requite.

FLUELLEN

Aunchient Pistol, I do partly understand your meaning.

PISTOL

Why then, rejoice therefore.

FLUELLEN

Certainly, aunchient, it is not a thing to rejoice
at: for if, look you, he were my brother, I would
desire the duke to use his good pleasure, and put
him to execution; for discipline ought to be used.

PISTOL

Die and be damn'd! and figo for thy friendship!

FLUELLEN

It is well.

PISTOL

The fig of Spain!

Exit

FLUELLEN

Very good.

Hark you, the king is coming, and I must speak with
him from the pridge.

Enter KING HENRY, with GLOUCESTER, YORK, MACMORRIS, the CHAPLAIN, and the BOY.

God pless your majesty!

KING HENRY V

How now, Fluellen! Came'st thou from the bridge?

FLUELLEN

Ay, so please your majesty. The Earl of Westmorland has very gallantly maintained the pridge: the French is gone off, look you; and there is gallant and most prave passages; the Earl of Westmorland is master of the pridge: I can tell your majesty, the duke is a prave man.

KING HENRY V

What men have you lost, Fluellen?

FLUELLEN

Marry, for my part, I think the duke hath lost never a man, but one that is like to be executed for robbing a church, one Bardolph, if your majesty know the man: his face is all bubukles, and whelks, and knobs, and flames o' fire: and his lips blows at his nose, and it is like a coal of fire. Here comes the man.

WESTMORLAND guiding BARDOLPH on, who has a noose about his neck, being taken to be hung.¹⁷⁸ PISTOL, and NYM following.

A moment between HENRY and BARDOLPH.

KING HENRY V

We would have all such offenders so cut off.

HENRY nods to WESTMORLAND, who drags off BARDOLPH (My lord! My lord!)

Exit PISTOL and NYM

We give express charge, that in our marches through the country, there be nothing compelled from the villages, nothing taken but paid for, none of the French upbraided or abused in disdainful language; for when lenity and cruelty play for a kingdom, the gentler gamester is the soonest winner.

Tucket. Enter MONTJOY

MONTJOY

You know me by my habit.

KING HENRY V

Well then I know thee: what shall I know of thee?

¹⁷⁸ A number of recent productions have chosen to show the execution of Bardolph on stage. I do find currency in having Henry have to face Bardolph himself and pass the sentence, since Bardolph is one of Henry's friends from his days at the Boar's Head tavern (see both parts of *Henry IV*); it makes the decision carry a greater deal of weight. In the original text they only talk of Bardolph and his sentence, he does not actually appear. Of interest, it is recorded that one of the English soldiers was indeed caught stealing from a church while on campaign and was hanged for the offense; it is Shakespeare's invention to make that soldier Bardolph.

MONTJOY

My master's mind.

KING HENRY V

Unfold it.

MONTJOY

Thus says my king: Say thou to Harry of England:
Though we seemed dead, we did but sleep: advantage
is a better soldier than rashness. Tell him we
could have rebuked him at Harfleur, but that we
thought not good to bruise an injury till it were
full ripe: now we speak upon our cue, and our voice
is imperial: England shall repent his folly, see
his weakness, and admire our sufferance. Bid him
therefore consider of his ransom; which must
proportion the losses we have borne, the subjects we
have lost, the disgrace we have digested.
To this add defiance: and tell him, for conclusion,
he hath betrayed his followers, whose condemnation is pronounced.
So far my king and master; so much my office.

KING HENRY V

What is thy name? I know thy quality.

MONTJOY

Montjoy.

KING HENRY V

Thou dost thy office fairly. Turn thee back.
And tell thy king I do not seek him now;
But could be willing to march on to Calais
Without impeachment: for, to say the sooth,
Though 'tis no wisdom to confess so much
Unto an enemy of craft and vantage,
My people are with sickness much enfeebled,
My numbers lessened.
Go therefore, tell thy master here I am;
My ransom is this frail and worthless trunk,
My army but a weak and sickly guard;
Yet, God before, tell him we will come on,
Though France himself and such another neighbour
Stand in our way.
If we may pass, we will; if we be hinder'd,
We shall your tawny ground with your red blood
Discolour: and so Montjoy, fare you well.
The sum of all our answer is but this:
We would not seek a battle, as we are;
Nor, as we are, we say we will not shun it:
So tell your master.

MONTJOY

I shall deliver so. Thanks to your highness.

Exit

KING HENRY V

March to the bridge; it now draws toward night:
Beyond the river we'll encamp ourselves,
And on to-morrow, bid them march away.

The soldiers begin to exit. The BOY pauses when he passes KING HENRY. As all others are gone...

GLOUCESTER

I hope they will not come upon us now.

KING HENRY V

We are in God's hand, brother, not in theirs.

Exit GLOUCESTER leaving HENRY alone on stage. The lights fade on HENRY as he looks to the heavens. Perhaps with doubt.

INTERMISSION

Part Two

*SFX Rain under the CHORUS*¹⁷⁹

CHORUS

Now entertain conjecture of a time
When creeping murmur and the poring dark
Fills the wide vessel of the universe.
From camp to camp through the foul womb of night
The hum of either army stilly sounds,
That the fixed sentinels almost receive
The secret whispers of each other's watch:
Fire answers fire, and through their paly flames
Each battle sees the other's umber'd face;
Steed threatens steed, in high and boastful neighs
Piercing the night's dull ear, and from the tents
The armourers, accomplishing the knights,
With busy hammers closing rivets up,
Give dreadful note of preparation:
Proud of their numbers and secure in soul,
The confident and over-lusty French
Do the low-rated English play at dice;
And chide the cripple tardy-gaited night
Who, like a foul and ugly witch, doth limp
So tediously away.
The country cocks do crow, the clocks do toll,
And the third hour of drowsy morning name.

SCENE VII.

Projection of the text: AGINCOURT

Lights reveal on one side of the stage, the CONSTABLE of France, the LORD RAMBURES, ORLEANS, and the DAUPHIN

DAUPHIN

Would it were day!

CONSTABLE

Tut! I have the best armour of the world.

ORLEANS

You have an excellent armour; but let my horse have his due.

CONSTABLE

It is the best horse of Europe.

ORLEANS

Will it never be morning?

¹⁷⁹ It rained the night before the battle of Agincourt.

DAUPHIN

My lord of Orleans, and my lord high constable, you
talk of horse and armour?

ORLEANS

You are as well provided of both as any prince in the world.

DAUPHIN

I will not change my horse with any that treads
but on four pasterns. When I bestride him, I
soar, I am a hawk: he trots the air; the earth
sings when he touches it.

ORLEANS

He's of the colour of the nutmeg.

DAUPHIN

And of the heat of the ginger. It is a beast for
Perseus: he is pure air and fire; and the dull
elements of earth and water never appear in him.
He is indeed a horse; and all other jades you
may call beasts.

CONSTABLE

Indeed, my lord, it is a most absolute and excellent horse.

DAUPHIN

It is the prince of palfreys; his neigh is like the
bidding of a monarch and his countenance enforces homage.

ORLEANS

No more, cousin.

DAUPHIN

Nay, the man hath no wit that cannot, from the
rising of the lark to the lodging of the lamb, vary
deserved praise on my palfrey. I
once writ a sonnet in his praise and began thus:
'Wonder of nature,'--

ORLEANS

I have heard a sonnet begin so to one's mistress.

DAUPHIN

Then did they imitate that which I composed to my
courser, for my horse is my mistress.

CONSTABLE

Methought yesterday your mistress shrewdly
shook your back.

DAUPHIN

So perhaps did yours.

CONSTABLE

Mine was not bridled.

DAUPHIN

O then belike she was old and gentle; and you rode,
like a kern of Ireland, your French hose off, and in
your straight strossers.

CONSTABLE

You have good judgment in horsemanship.

DAUPHIN

Be warned by me, then: they that ride so and ride
not warily, fall into foul bogs. I had rather have
my horse to my mistress.

CONSTABLE

I had as lief have my mistress a jade.

DAUPHIN

Will it never be day? I will trot to-morrow a mile, and
my way shall be paved with English faces.

CONSTABLE

I will not say so, for fear I should be faced out of
my way: but I would it were morning; for I would
fain be about the ears of the English.

RAMBURES

Who will go to hazard with me for twenty prisoners?

CONSTABLE

You must first go yourself to hazard, ere you have them.

DAUPHIN

'Tis after midnight; I'll go arm myself.

Exit

ORLEANS

The Dauphin longs for morning.

RAMBURES

He longs to eat the English.

CONSTABLE

I think he will eat all he kills.

ORLEANS

He never did harm, that I heard of.

CONSTABLE

Nor will do none to-morrow.

ORLEANS

I know him to be valiant.

CONSTABLE

I was told that by one that knows him better than you.

ORLEANS

What's he?

CONSTABLE

Marry, he told me so himself; and he said he cared not who knew it.

ORLEANS

He needs not; it is no hidden virtue in him.

CONSTABLE

By my faith, sir, but it is; never any body saw it but his lackey: 'tis a hooded valour; and when it appears, it will bate.

Enter MONTJOY

MONTJOY

My lord high constable, the English lie within fifteen hundred paces of your tents.

CONSTABLE

Who hath measured the ground?

MONTJOY

The Lord Grandpre.

CONSTABLE

A valiant and most expert gentleman. Would it were day! Alas, poor Harry of England! he longs not for the dawning as we do.

ORLEANS

What a wretched and peevish fellow is this king of England, to mope with his fat-brained followers so far out of his knowledge!

CONSTABLE

If the English had any apprehension, they would run away.

ORLEANS

That they lack; for if their heads had any intellectual armour, they could never wear such heavy head-pieces.

RAMBURES

That island of England breeds very valiant creatures; their mastiffs are of unmatchable courage.

CONSTABLE

Now is it time to arm: come, shall we about it?

ORLEANS

It is now three o'clock: but, let me see, by ten
We shall have each a hundred Englishmen.

Exeunt

ACT IV

SFX Rain continues

CHORUS

The poor condemned English,
Like sacrifices, by their watchful fires
Sit patiently and inly ruminate
The morning's danger, and their gesture sad
Investing lank-lean; cheeks and war-worn coats
Presenteth them unto the gazing moon
So many horrid ghosts. O now, who will behold
The royal captain of this ruin'd band
Walking from watch to watch, from tent to tent,
Let him cry 'Praise and glory on his head!'
For forth he goes and visits all his host.
Bids them good morrow with a modest smile
And calls them brothers, friends and countrymen.
Upon his royal face there is no note
How dread an army hath enrounded him;
Nor doth he dedicate one jot of colour
Unto the weary and all-watched night,
But freshly looks and over-bears attaint
With cheerful semblance and sweet majesty;
That every wretch, pining and pale before,
Beholding him, plucks comfort from his looks.
A largess universal like the sun
His liberal eye doth give to every one,
A little touch of Harry in the night.

Exit

SCENE I. The English camp at Agincourt.

Enter KING HENRY, GLOUCESTER, YORK, and the CHAPLAIN, meeting ERPINGHAM

KING HENRY V

Good morrow, old Sir Thomas Erpingham:
A good soft pillow for that good white head
Were better than a churlish turf of France.

ERPINGHAM

Not so, my liege: this lodging likes me better,
Since I may say 'Now lie I like a king.'

KING HENRY V

'Tis good for men to love their present pains
Upon example; so the spirit is eased.
Lend me thy cloak, Sir Thomas. Brother Gloucester,
Commend me to the princes in our camp;
Do my good morrow to them, and anon
Desire them an to my pavilion.

GLOUCESTER

We shall, my liege.

ERPINGHAM

Shall I attend your grace?

KING HENRY V

No, my good knight;
I and my bosom must debate awhile,
And then I would no other company.

ERPINGHAM

The Lord in heaven bless thee, noble Harry!

Exeunt all but KING HENRY, and the CHAPLAIN is near by

KING HENRY V

God-a-mercy, old heart! thou speak'st cheerfully.

Enter PISTOL

PISTOL

Qui va la?

KING HENRY V

A friend.

PISTOL

Discuss unto me; art thou officer?
Or art thou base, common and popular?

KING HENRY V

I am a gentleman of a company.

PISTOL

Trail'st thou the puissant pike?

KING HENRY V

Even so. What are you?

PISTOL

As good a gentleman as the emperor.

KING HENRY V

Then you are a better than the king.

PISTOL

The king's a bawcock, and a heart of gold,
A lad of life, an imp of fame;
Of parents good, of fist most valiant.
I kiss his dirty shoe, and from heart-string
I love the lovely bully. What is thy name?

KING HENRY V

Harry le Roy.

PISTOL

Le Roy! a Cornish name: art thou of Cornish crew?

KING HENRY V

No, I am a Welshman.

PISTOL

Know'st thou Fluellen?

KING HENRY V

Yes.

PISTOL

Tell him, I'll knock his leek about his pate
Upon Saint Davy's day.

KING HENRY V

Do not you wear your dagger in your cap that day,
lest he knock that about yours.

PISTOL

Art thou his friend?

KING HENRY V

And his kinsman too.

PISTOL

The figo for thee, then!

KING HENRY V

I thank you: God be with you!

PISTOL

My name is Pistol call'd.

Exit

KING HENRY V

It sorts well with your fierceness.

SFX Rain fades away

Enter FLUELLEN meeting GOWER at a fire

GOWER

Captain Fluellen!

FLUELLEN

So! in the name of Jesu Christ, speak lower.

If you would take the pains but to
examine the wars of Pompey the Great, you shall
find, I warrant you, that there is no tiddle toddle
nor pibble pabble in Pompey's camp.

GOWER

Why, the enemy is loud; you hear him all night.

FLUELLEN

If the enemy is an ass and a fool and a prating
coxcomb, is it meet, think you, that we should also,
look you, be an ass and a fool and a prating
coxcomb? in your own conscience, now?

GOWER

I will speak lower.

FLUELLEN

I pray you and beseech you that you will.

Exeunt GOWER and FLUELLEN

KING HENRY V

Though it appear a little out of fashion,
There is much care and valour in this Welshman.

JOHN BATES, and MICHAEL WILLIAMS at another fire

WILLIAMS

Brother John Bates, is not that the morning which
breaks yonder?

BATES

I think it be, Williams: but we have no great cause to desire
the approach of day.

WILLIAMS

We see yonder the beginning of the day, but I think
we shall never see the end of it. Who goes there?

KING HENRY V

A friend.

WILLIAMS

Under what captain serve you?

KING HENRY V

Under Sir Thomas Erpingham.

WILLIAMS

A good old commander and a most kind gentleman: I pray you, what thinks he of our estate?

KING HENRY V

Even as men wrecked upon a sand, that look to be washed off the next tide.

BATES

He hath not told his thought to the king?

KING HENRY V

No; nor it is not meet he should. For, though I speak it to you, I think the king is but a man, as I am: his ceremonies laid by, in his nakedness he appears but a man; and though his affections are higher mounted than ours, yet, when they stoop, they stoop with the like wing. Therefore, when he sees reason of fears, as we do, his fears, out of doubt, be of the same relish as ours are.

BATES

He may show what outward courage he will; but I believe, as cold a night as 'tis, he could wish himself in Thames up to the neck; and so I would he were, and I by him, at all adventures, so we were quit here.

KING HENRY V

I think he would not wish himself any where but where he is.

BATES

Then I would he were here alone; so should he be sure to be ransomed, and a many poor men's lives saved.

KING HENRY V

Methinks I could not die any where so contented as in the king's company; his cause being just and his quarrel honourable.

WILLIAMS

That's more than we know.

BATES

Ay, or more than we should seek after; for we know enough, if we know we are the king's subjects: if

his cause be wrong, our obedience to the king wipes the crime of it out of us.

WILLIAMS

But if the cause be not good, the king himself hath a heavy reckoning to make, when all those legs and arms and heads, chopped off in battle, shall join together at the latter day and cry all 'We died at such a place;' some swearing, some crying for a surgeon, some upon their wives left poor behind them, some upon the debts they owe, some upon their children rawly left. I am afeard there are few die well that die in a battle; for how can they charitably dispose of any thing, when blood is their argument? Now, if these men do not die well, it will be a black matter for the king that led them to it.

KING HENRY V

So, if a son that is by his father sent about merchandise do sinfully miscarry upon the sea, the imputation of his wickedness by your rule, should be imposed upon his father that sent him. But this is not so: the king is not bound to answer the particular endings of his soldiers, nor the father of his son; for they purpose not their death, when they purpose their services. Besides, there is no king, be his cause never so spotless, if it come to the arbitrement of swords, can try it out with all unspotted soldiers: some peradventure have on them the guilt of premeditated and contrived crimes. Now, if these men have defeated the law and outrun native punishment, though they can outstrip men, they have no wings to fly from God: war is his beadle, war is vengeance. Then if they die unprovided, no more is the king guilty of their damnation than he was before guilty of those impieties for the which they are now visited. Every subject's duty is the king's; but every subject's soul is his own.

WILLIAMS

'Tis certain, every man that dies ill, the ill upon his own head, the king is not to answer it.

BATES

But I do not desire he should answer for me; and yet I am expected to fight lustily for him.

KING HENRY V

I myself heard the king say he would not be ransomed.

WILLIAMS

Ay, he said so, to make us fight cheerfully: but when our throats are cut, he may be ransomed, and we ne'er the wiser.

KING HENRY V

If I live to see it, I will never trust his word after.

WILLIAMS

You pay him then. That's a perilous shot out of an elder-gun, that a poor and private displeasure can do against a monarch! you may as well go about to turn the sun to ice with fanning in his face with a peacock's feather. You'll never trust his word after! come, 'tis a foolish saying.

KING HENRY V

Your reproof is something too round: I should be angry with you, if the time were convenient.

WILLIAMS

Let it be a quarrel between us, if you live.

KING HENRY V

I embrace it.

WILLIAMS

How shall I know thee again?

KING HENRY V

Give me any glove of thine, and I will wear it in my belt: then, if ever thou dare'st acknowledge it, I will make it my quarrel.¹⁸⁰

WILLIAMS

Here's my glove: give me another of thine.

KING HENRY V

There.

They exchange gloves

WILLIAMS

This will I also wear in my belt: if ever thou come to me and say, after to-morrow, 'This is my glove,' by this hand, I will take thee a box on the ear.

KING HENRY V

If ever I live to see it, I will challenge it.

WILLIAMS

Thou dare'st as well be hanged.

KING HENRY V

¹⁸⁰ I have changed "gage" to "glove", and "bonnet" to "belt".

Well. I will do it, though I take thee in the king's company.

WILLIAMS

Keep thy word: fare thee well.

BATES

Be friends, you English fools, be friends: we have French quarrels enow, if you could tell how to reckon.

Exeunt soldiers

The CHAPLAIN comes forward and overhears HENRY.

KING HENRY V

Upon the king! let us our lives, our souls,
Our debts, our careful wives,
Our children and our sins lay on the king!
We must bear all. O hard condition,
Twin-born with greatness! What infinite heart's-ease
Must kings neglect, that private men enjoy!
And what have kings, that privates have not too,
Save ceremony, save general ceremony?
And what art thou, thou idle ceremony?
What kind of god art thou, that suffer'st more
Of mortal griefs than do thy worshippers?
O ceremony, show me but thy worth!
What is thy soul of adoration?
Art thou aught else but place, degree and form,
Creating awe and fear in other men?
What drink'st thou oft, instead of homage sweet,
But poison'd flattery? O, be sick, great greatness,
And bid thy ceremony give thee cure!
Canst thou, when thou command'st the beggar's knee,
Command the health of it? No, thou proud dream,
That play'st so subtly with a king's repose;
I am a king that find thee, and I know
'Tis not the balm, the sceptre and the ball,
The sword, the mace, the crown imperial,
The farced title running 'fore the king,
The throne he sits on, nor the tide of pomp
That beats upon the high shore of this world,
No, not all these, thrice-gorgeous ceremony,
Not all these, laid in bed majestical,
Can sleep so soundly as the wretched slave,
Who with a body fill'd and vacant mind
Gets him to rest, cramm'd with distressful bread;
Never sees horrid night, the child of hell,

But, like a lackey, from the rise to set
Sweats in the eye of Phoebus and all night
Sleeps in Elysium; next day after dawn,
Doth rise and help Hyperion to his horse,
And follows so the ever-running year,
With profitable labour, to his grave:
And, but for ceremony, such a wretch,
Winding up days with toil and nights with sleep,
Had the fore-hand and vantage of a king.

Enter ERPINGHAM

ERPINGHAM

My lord, your nobles, jealous of your absence,
Seek through your camp to find you.

KING HENRY V

Good old knight,
Collect them all together at my tent:
I'll be before thee.

ERPINGHAM

I shall do't, my lord.

ERPINGHAM exits, and the CHAPLAIN comes forward and kneels. HENRY, taking his cue from the CHAPLAIN also kneels.

KING HENRY V

O God of battles! steel my soldiers' hearts;
Possess them not with fear; take from them now
The sense of reckoning, if the opposed numbers
Pluck their hearts from them. Not to-day, O Lord,
O, not to-day, think not upon the fault
My father made in compassing the crown!
I Richard's body have interred anew;
And on it have bestow'd more contrite tears
Than from it issued forced blood: and I have built
Two chantries, where the sad and solemn priests
Sing still for Richard's soul. More will I do;
Though all that I can do is nothing worth,
Since that my penitence comes after all,
Imploring pardon.

GLOUCESTER (*offstage*)

My liege!

KING HENRY V

My brother Gloucester's voice.

GLOUCESTER enters

I know thy errand, I will go with thee:
The day, my friends, and all things stay for me.

Exeunt

SCENE II. The French camp.

Enter the DAUPHIN, ORLEANS, the CONSTABLE, and RAMBURES

ORLEANS

The sun doth gild our armour; up, my lords!

DAUPHIN

Montez A cheval! My horse! varlet! laquais! ha!

CONSTABLE

Hark, how our steeds for present service neigh!

DAUPHIN

Mount them, and make incision in their hides,
That their hot blood may spin in English eyes!

RAMBURES

What, will you have them weep our horses' blood?
How shall we, then, behold their natural tears?

Enter MONTJOY

MONTJOY

The English are embattled, you French peers.

CONSTABLE

Do but behold yon poor and starved band,
And your fair show shall suck away their souls,
Leaving them but the shales and husks of men.
There is not work enough for all our hands;
Scarce blood enough in all their sickly veins
To give each naked curtle-axe a stain,
That our French gallants shall to-day draw out,
And sheathe for lack of sport. What is to say?
For our approach shall so much dare the field
That England shall couch down in fear and yield.

RAMBURES

Why do we stay so long, my lords of France?
Yon island carrions, desperate of their bones,
Ill-favouredly become the morning field:

Their ragged curtains poorly are let loose,
And our air shakes them passing scornfully.

CONSTABLE

They have said their prayers, and they stay for death.

DAUPHIN

Shall we go send them dinners and fresh suits
And give their fasting horses provender,
And after fight with them?

CONSTABLE

To horse, you gallant princes! To the field!
I will the banner from a trumpet take,
And use it for my haste. Come, come, away!
The sun is high, and we outwear the day.

Exeunt

SCENE III. The English camp.

Enter GLOUCESTER, YORK, and WESTMORLAND

YORK

Where is the king?

BEDFORD

The king himself is rode to view their battle.

WESTMORLAND

Of fighting men they have full three score thousand.

YORK

There's five to one; besides, they all are fresh.

Enter KING HENRY and his CHAPLAIN

WESTMORLAND

Tis fearful odds. O that we now had here
But one ten thousand of those men in England
That do no work to-day!

KING HENRY V¹⁸¹

What's he that wishes so?

My cousin Westmorland? No, my fair cousin:
If we are mark'd to die, we are enow
To do our country loss; and if to live,

¹⁸¹ This speech is also left completely intact. It can be played as a rousing rally to the entire army (see Olivier or Branagh), or can be much more intimate (see Rylance or Hiddleston). Since there are other speeches in which King Henry can play to the masses, I believe the stronger choice is to go intimate.

The fewer men, the greater share of honour.
 God's will! I pray thee, wish not one man more.
Enter FLUELLEN and GOWER
 By Jove, I am not covetous for gold,
 Nor care I who doth feed upon my cost;
 It yearns me not if men my garments wear;
 Such outward things dwell not in my desires:
 But if it be a sin to covet honour,
 I am the most offending soul alive.
Enter MACMORRIS and JAMY
 No, faith, my coz, wish not a man from England:
 God's peace! I would not lose so great an honour
 As one man more, methinks, would share from me
 For the best hope I have. O, do not wish one more!
 Rather proclaim it, Westmorland, through my host,
 That he which hath no stomach to this fight,
 Let him depart; his passport shall be made
 And crowns for convoy put into his purse:
 We would not die in that man's company
 That fears his fellowship to die with us.
 This day is called the feast of Crispian:
 He that outlives this day, and comes safe home,
 Will stand a tip-toe when the day is named,
 And rouse him at the name of Crispian.
 He that shall live this day, and see old age,
 Will yearly on the vigil feast his neighbours,
 And say 'To-morrow is Saint Crispian:'
 Then will he strip his sleeve and show his scars.
 And say 'These wounds I had on Crispin's day.'
 Old men forget: yet all shall be forgot,
 But he'll remember with advantages
 What feats he did that day: then shall our names
 Familiar in his mouth as household words
 Be in their flowing cups freshly remember'd.
 This story shall the good man teach his son;
 And Crispin Crispian shall ne'er go by,
 From this day to the ending of the world,
 But we in it shall be remember'd;
 We few, we happy few, we band of brothers;
 For he to-day that sheds his blood with me
 Shall be my brother; be he ne'er so vile,
 This day shall gentle his condition:
 And gentlemen in England now a-bed
 Shall think themselves accursed they were not here,
 And hold their manhoods cheap whiles any speaks
 That fought with us upon Saint Crispin's day.

Enter ERPINGHAM

ERPINGHAM

My sovereign lord, bestow yourself with speed:
The French are bravely in their battles set,
And will with all expedience charge on us.

KING HENRY V

All things are ready, if our minds be so.

WESTMORLAND

Perish the man whose mind is backward now!

KING HENRY V

Thou dost not wish more help from England, coz?

WESTMORLAND

God's will! my liege, would you and I alone,
Without more help, could fight this royal battle!

KING HENRY V

Why, now thou hast unwish'd five thousand men;
Which likes me better than to wish us one.
You know your places: God be with you all!

Tucket. Enter MONTJOY

MONTJOY

Once more I come to know of thee, King Harry,
If for thy ransom thou wilt now compound,
Before thy most assured overthrow.

KING HENRY V

Who hath sent thee now?

MONTJOY

The Constable of France.

KING HENRY V

I pray thee, bear my former answer back:
Bid them achieve me and then sell my bones.
Good God! why should they mock poor fellows thus?
Let me speak proudly: tell the Constable
We are but warriors for the working-day;
And, by the mass, our hearts are in the trim.
Come thou no more for ransom, gentle herald:
They shall have none, I swear, but these my joints;
Which if they have as I will leave 'em them,
Shall yield them little, tell the Constable.

MONTJOY

I shall, King Harry. And so fare thee well:
Thou never shalt hear herald any more.

Exit

KING HENRY V

I fear thou'lt once more come again for ransom.

YORK

My lord, most humbly on my knee I beg
The leading of the vanguard.¹⁸²

KING HENRY V

Take it, brave York. Now, soldiers, march away:
And how thou pleasest, God, dispose the day!

Exeunt

CHORUS

And so our scene must to the battle fly;
Where--O for pity! --we shall much disgrace
With four or five most vile and ragged foils,
Right ill-disposed in brawl ridiculous,
The name of Agincourt. Yet sit and see,
Minding true things by what their mockeries be.

SCENE IV. The field of battle.

*Alarum. Excursions.*¹⁸³

A French Soldier meets JAMY in battle, GOWER helps a wounded JAMY from the field.

*The French Soldier then meets GLOUCESTER in battle, and is joined by a second French Soldier. GLOUCESTER is in danger of being defeated and KING HENRY comes to his aid.*¹⁸⁴
One French soldier flees, and the second is taken prisoner by GLOUCESTER.

KING HENRY

Archers. Knock. Draw. Loose.

*SFX Arrow volley*¹⁸⁵

Exeunt

¹⁸² See note 7.

¹⁸³ The only stage direction in the existing text is 'Alarum. Excursions.', which gives any production an opportunity to represent the battle as they choose. All of the following references to the battle of Agincourt represent the choices I made for our production.

¹⁸⁴ This is an event that is described in some chronicles; Henry coming to the aid of his youngest brother during the battle of Agincourt.

¹⁸⁵ Another moment of creative license. Given the importance of the English archers at the battle of Agincourt I want to include them in some way, even though there is no direct reference in Shakespeare's play.

Enter PISTOL, and French Soldier. They fight, and PISTOL disarms the French Soldier.

PISTOL

Yield, cur!

FRENCH SOLDIER

Je pense que vous etes gentilhomme de bonne qualite.

PISTOL

Qualitie? Art thou a gentleman? what is thy name? discuss.

FRENCH SOLDIER

O Seigneur Dieu!

PISTOL

O, Signieur Dew should be a gentleman:
Perpend my words, O Signieur Dew, and mark;
O Signieur Dew, thou diest on point of fox,
Except, O signieur, thou do give to me
Egregious ransom.

FRENCH SOLDIER

O, prenez misericorde! ayez pitie de moi!

PISTOL

Moy shall not serve; I will have forty moys;
Or I will fetch thy rim out at thy throat
In drops of crimson blood.

FRENCH SOLDIER

Est-il impossible d'echapper la force de ton bras?

PISTOL

Brass, cur!
Thou damned and luxurious mountain goat,
Offer'st me brass?

FRENCH SOLDIER

O pardonnez moi!

PISTOL

Say'st thou me so? is that a ton of moys?

BOY enters

Come hither, boy: ask me this slave in French
What is his name.

BOY

Ecoutez: comment etes-vous appele?

FRENCH SOLDIER

Monsieur le Fer.

BOY

He says his name is Master Fer.

PISTOL

Master Fer! I'll fer him, and firk him, and ferret him: discuss the same in French unto him.

BOY

I do not know the French for fer, and ferret, and firk.

FRENCH SOLDIER

O, je vous supplie, pour l'amour de Dieu, me pardonner! Je suis gentilhomme de bonne maison: gardez ma vie, et je vous donnerai deux cents ecus.

PISTOL

What are his words?

BOY

He prays you to save his life: he is a gentleman of a good house; and for his ransom he will give you two hundred crowns.

PISTOL

Tell him my fury shall abate, and I the crowns will take.

FRENCH SOLDIER

Petit monsieur, que dit-il?

BOY

Encore qu'il est contre son jurement de pardonner aucun prisonnier, néanmoins, pour les ecus que vous l'avez promis, il est content de vous donner la liberte, le franchisement.

FRENCH SOLDIER

Sur mes genoux je vous donne mille remercimens; et je m'estime heureux que je suis tombe entre les mains d'un chevalier, je pense, le plus brave, vaillant, et tres distingue seigneur d'Angleterre.

PISTOL

Expound unto me, boy.

BOY

He gives you, upon his knees, a thousand thanks; and he esteems himself happy that he hath fallen into the hands of one, as he thinks, the most brave, valorous, and thrice-worthy signieur of England.

PISTOL

As I suck blood, I will some mercy show.
Follow me!

BOY

Suivez-vous le grand capitaine.

Exeunt PISTOL, and FRENCH SOLDIER

I did never know so full a voice issue from so empty a heart: but the saying is true 'The empty vessel makes the greatest sound.' Bardolph and Nym had ten times more valour than this roaring devil i' the old play, that every one may pare his nails with a wooden dagger; and they are both hanged; and so would this be, if he durst steal any thing adventurously. I must stay with the lackeys, with the luggage of our camp: the French might have a good prey of us, if he knew of it; for there is none to guard it but boys.

Exit

SCENE V. Another part of the field.

Enter CONSTABLE, ORLEANS, DAUPHIN, and RAMBURES

DAUPHIN

O perdurable shame! let's stab ourselves.
Be these the wretches that we play'd at dice for?

ORLEANS

Is this the king we sent to for his ransom?

CONSTABLE

Shame and eternal shame, nothing but shame!
Let us die in honour: once more back again.

DAUPHIN

Disorder, that hath spoil'd us, friend us now!
Let us on heaps go offer up our lives.

ORLEANS

We are enough yet living in the field
To smother up the English in our throngs,
If any order might be thought upon.

CONSTABLE

The devil take order now! I'll to the throng:
Let life be short; else shame will be too long.

Into ...

SCENE VI. The field.

Alarums.

Enter YORK, FLUELLEN, and MACMORRIS

The CONSTABLE meets YORK, ORLEANS meets FLUELLEN, and RAMBURES meets MACMORRIS. The DAUPHIN flees.

FLUELLEN and ORLEANS carry their fight offstage. RAMBURES is injured and exits. The CONSTABLE takes on both YORK and MACMORRIS. MACMORRIS is eventually wounded and told to leave the field, leaving YORK and the CONSTABLE to fight alone. During their fight YORK is killed.

Enter KING HENRY where he sees YORK's body and meets the CONSTABLE. They fight, and the CONSTABLE eventually falls.¹⁸⁶ GLOUCESTER, WESTMORLAND, and other English soldiers enter with two French prisoners.

KING HENRY V

Well have we done, thrice valiant countrymen:
But all's not done; yet keep the French the field.¹⁸⁷

Alarum

But, hark! what new alarum is this same?
The French have reinforced their scatter'd men.

A moment of decision from KING HENRY.

Let every soldier kill his prisoners.¹⁸⁸

Hesitation from the soldiers

GLOUCESTER

My, lord!

KING HENRY V

Give the word through. I said to give the word!

¹⁸⁶ Both the Duke of York and the Constable of France died in the battle of Agincourt. Instead of only hearing about their deaths, I wanted to see those events take place on stage.

¹⁸⁷ I have removed the exchange that is usually between Exeter and the King, relaying the deaths of York and Suffolk. It is a scene that often drags down the action, given that it is about one character we meet very briefly before the battle, and another who we are never introduced to at all. This production, however, has a more present York, but no Exeter.

¹⁸⁸ Another moment of great importance; Henry's order to kill the French prisoners. In the original script, Henry gives the order in two different spots. Similar to Thea Sharrock's film, I have conflated the two into one single moment. However, I very purposely kept the order so that it happens before the French attack the luggage train and kill the boys. I do not want it to appear that Henry gave the order to kill the prisoners in response to the French soldiers' actions.

As bodies are removed and exits are made, the two French prisoners are taken upstage and are executed.

Exeunt

SCENE VII. Another part of the field.

The BOY enters and is eventually trapped between ORLEANS and RAMBURES.

ORLEANS disarms the BOY, and RAMBURES then stabs the BOY. RAMBURES and ORLEANS exit, leaving the BOY to die.¹⁸⁹

Enter FLUELLEN and GOWER, finding the body of the BOY. The CHAPLAIN enters shortly after.

FLUELLEN

Kill the poys and the luggage! 'tis expressly
against the law of arms: 'tis as arrant a piece of
knavery, mark you now, as can be offer't; in your
conscience, now, is it not?

GOWER

'Tis certain there's not a boy left alive; and the
cowardly rascals that ran from the battle ha' done
this slaughter. Here comes his majesty.

Enter KING HENRY, GLOUCESTER, WESTMORLAND, and MACMORRIS seeing the BOY dead in FLUELLEN's arms.

KING HENRY V

I was not angry since I came to France
Until this instant. Take a horse, my brother;
Ride thou unto the Frenchmen on yon hill:
Bid them come down, and fight with us. If not,
Then void the field; they do offend our sight:
If they'll do neither, we will come to them,
And make them skirr away, as swift as stones
Enforced from the old Assyrian slings.
Go and tell them so.¹⁹⁰

Enter MONTJOY

GLOUCESTER

¹⁸⁹ Similar to the deaths of York and the Constable of France, I wanted to somehow stage the killing of the boys. Since the Boy has a foreshadowing line in his final speech of his previous scene of what may happen if the French realized that the luggage is only guarded by boys, it becomes a strong dramatic moment to have the Boy be one of the boys that are in fact killed.

¹⁹⁰ I have removed the second reference of Henry's for killing the French prisoner. See note 25.

Here comes the herald of the French, my liege.

WESTMORLAND

His eyes are humbler than they used to be.

KING HENRY V

What means this, herald? (*referring to the BOY*)¹⁹¹
Come'st thou again for ransom?

MONTJOY

No, great king:

I come to thee for charitable licence,
That we may wander o'er this bloody field
To book our dead, and then to bury them;
To sort our nobles from our common men.

O, give us leave, great king,
To view the field in safety and dispose
Of their dead bodies!

KING HENRY V

I tell thee truly, herald,
I know not if the day be ours or no;
For yet a many of your horsemen peer
And gallop o'er the field.

MONTJOY

The day is yours.

KING HENRY V

Praised be God, and not our strength, for it!
What is this castle call'd that stands hard by?

MONTJOY

They call it Agincourt.

KING HENRY V

Then call we this the field of Agincourt,
Fought on the day of Crispin Crispianus.
Some captains go with him: bring me just notice
Of the numbers dead on both our parts.

Exeunt GLOUCESTER, GOWER and WESTMORELAND with MONTJOY.

PISTOL enters and rushes to the BOY. FLUELLEN passes the BOY to PISTOL, who carries off the BOY's body. PISTOL stares down KING HENRY as he exits.

KING HENRY is left with FLUELLEN and the CHAPLAIN near by.

FLUELLEN

Your grandfather of famous memory, an't please your
majesty, and your great-uncle Edward the Plack

¹⁹¹ If this half line stays as a direct reference to the Boy, then Henry can take a pause before starting the next shared line with Montjoy.

Prince of Wales, as I have read in the chronicles,
fought a most prave pattle here in France.

KING HENRY V

They did, Fluellen.

FLUELLEN

Your majesty says very true: if your majesties is
remembered of it, the Welshmen did good service in a
garden where leeks did grow, wearing leeks in their
Monmouth caps; which, your majesty know, to this
hour is an honourable badge of the service; and I do
believe your majesty takes no scorn to wear the leek
upon Saint Tavy's day.

KING HENRY V

I wear it for a memorable honour;
For I am Welsh, you know, good countryman.

FLUELLEN

All the water in Wye cannot wash your majesty's
Welsh plood out of your pody, I can tell you that:
God pless it and preserve it, as long as it pleases
his grace, and his majesty too!

KING HENRY V

Thanks, good my countryman.

FLUELLEN

By Jeshu, I am your majesty's countryman, I care not
who know it; I will confess it to all the 'orld: I
need not to be ashamed of your majesty, praised be
God, so long as your majesty is an honest man.

WILLIAMS enters along with BATES, KING HENRY sees them.

KING HENRY V

God keep me so. Call yonder fellow hither.¹⁹²

FLUELLEN

Soldier, you must come to the king.

KING HENRY V

Soldier, what is thy name?

WILLIAMS

'Tis Michael Williams, my liege.

KING HENRY V

And why wear'st thou that glove in thy belt?

¹⁹² By moving the exit of Montjoy earlier, this allows the play to move directly into the scenes with Williams. It trims more text that normally would exist between the two Williams scenes that follow the battle, but still gives some passage of time for the dead to be counted.

WILLIAMS

An't please your majesty, 'tis the glove of one that
I should fight withal, if he be alive.

KING HENRY V

An Englishman?

WILLIAMS

An't please your majesty, a rascal that swaggered
with me last night; who, if alive and ever dare to
challenge this glove, I have sworn to take him a box
o' th' ear: or if I can see my glove in his cap,
which he swore, as he was a soldier, he would wear
if alive, I will strike it out soundly.

KING HENRY V

What think you, Captain Fluellen? is it fit this
soldier keep his oath?

FLUELLEN

He is a craven and a villain else, an't please your
majesty, in my conscience.

KING HENRY V

It may be his enemy is a gentleman of great sort,
quite from the answer of his degree.

FLUELLEN

Though he be as good a gentleman as the devil is, as
Lucifer and Belzebub himself, it is necessary, look
your grace, that he keep his vow and his oath: if
he be perjured, see you now, his reputation is as
arrant a villain as ever his black shoe trod upon
God's ground and his earth!

KING HENRY V

Then keep thy vow, sirrah, when thou meet'st the fellow.

WILLIAMS

So I will, my liege, as I live.

SCENE VIII. (*sections cut and cont. directly from above*)¹⁹³

KING HENRY V

Give me thy glove, soldier: look, here is the
fellow of it.

'Twas I, indeed, thou promised to strike;
And thou hast given me most bitter terms.

¹⁹³ The heralds need to have time to leave and count the dead, but in the interest of time the section of Henry giving the glove to Fluellen so that he will be mistakenly be struck by Williams has been cut, and the scene plays straight through to Henry showing the glove to Williams.

How canst thou make me satisfaction?

WILLIAMS

All offences, my lord, come from the heart: never came any from mine that might offend your majesty.

KING HENRY V

It was ourself thou didst abuse.

WILLIAMS

Your majesty came not like yourself: you appeared to me but as a common man; witness the night, your garments, your lowliness; and what your highness suffered under that shape, I beseech you take it for your own fault and not mine: for had you been as I took you for, I made no offence; therefore, I beseech your highness, pardon me.

KING HENRY V

Here, good Fluellen, fill this glove with crowns,
And give it to this fellow. Keep it, fellow;
And wear it for an honour in thy belt
Till I do challenge it. Give him the crowns.

FLUELLEN

By this day and this light, the fellow has mettle enough in his belly. Hold, there is twelve pence for you; and I pray you to serve Got, and keep you out of prawls, and prabbles' and quarrels, and dissensions, and, I warrant you, it is the better for you.

WILLIAMS

I will none of your money.

FLUELLEN

It is with a good will; I can tell you, it will serve you to mend your shoes: come, wherefore should you be so pashful? your shoes is not so good: 'tis a good silling, I warrant you, or I will change it.

Enter GLOUCESTER, WESTMORLAND, and GOWER.

KING HENRY V

Now, Gower, are the dead number'd?

GOWER

Here is the number of the slaughter'd French.

GOWER hands a paper to KING HENRY

KING HENRY V

What prisoners of good sort are taken, brother?

GLOUCESTER

Charles Duke of Orleans, nephew to the king;
Of other lords and barons, knights and squires,
Full fifteen hundred, besides common men.

KING HENRY V

This note doth tell me of ten thousand French
That in the field lie slain: of princes, in this number,
And nobles bearing banners, there lie dead
One hundred twenty six: added to these,
Of knights, esquires, and gallant gentlemen,
Eight thousand and four hundred; of the which,
Five hundred were but yesterday dubb'd knights.
Here was a royal fellowship of death!
Where is the number of our English dead?

GOWER shows him another paper

Edward the Duke of York, the Earl of Suffolk,
Sir Richard Ketly, Davy Gam, esquire:
None else of name; and of all other men
But five and twenty.

WESTMORLAND

O God, 'tis wonderful!

KING HENRY V

Come, go we in procession to the village.
And be it death proclaimed through our host
To boast of this or take the praise from God
Which is his only.

FLUELLEN

Is it not lawful, an please your majesty, to tell
how many is killed?

KING HENRY V

Yes, captain; but with this acknowledgement,
That God fought for us.
Let there be sung 'Non nobis' and 'Te Deum;'
The dead with charity enclosed in clay:
And then to Calais; and to England then:
Where ne'er from France arrived more happy men.

Exeunt, singing Non nobis and Te Deum

ACT V**CHORUS**

Vouchsafe to those that have not read the story,
 That I may prompt them: and of such as have,
 I humbly pray them to admit the excuse
 Of time, of numbers and due course of things,
 Which cannot in their huge and proper life
 Be here presented.¹⁹⁴ Now we bear the king
 Toward Calais: grant him there; there seen,
 Heave him away upon your winged thoughts
 Athwart the sea. Behold, and see him land;
 And solemnly see him set on to London.
 How London doth pour out her citizens!
 The mayor and all his brethren in best sort,
 Like to the senators of the antique Rome,
 With the plebeians swarming at their heels,
 Go forth and fetch their conquering Caesar in.¹⁹⁵
 For now, the lamentation of the French
 Invites the King of England's stay at home;
 The emperor's coming in behalf of France,
 To order peace between them; and omit
 All the occurrences, whatever chanced,
 Till Harry's back-return again to France:
 There must we bring him; and myself have play'd
 The interim, by remembering you 'tis past.
 Then brook abridgment, and your eyes advance,
 After your thoughts, straight back again to France.

Exit

SCENE I. Cut¹⁹⁶

SCENE II.

Projection of the text: TROYES

¹⁹⁴ This essentially is the moment where we begin to jump the events of 1416 to 1419 (King Henry's return to England and his second campaign through France), and pick up at the Treaty of Troyes in 1420.

¹⁹⁵ The reference to the Earl of Essex has been cut, as is very common, since we are not an Elizabethan audience being referred to.

¹⁹⁶ This scene between Fluellen, Gower, and Pistol is very much in keeping with the early scenes, and yet if we are following the Chorus, then we have moved on to 1420 for the signing of the Treaty of Troyes. Its placement most likely suggests an opportunity to give the actor playing Henry a longer break and more time for a potential costume change out of whatever the actor was wearing for the battle scenes into something for the final court scene.

Enter, at one door KING HENRY, GLOUCESTER, WESTMORLAND, and the CHAPLAIN; at another, the FRENCH KING, QUEEN ISABEL, the PRINCESS KATHARINE, and ALICE; also, the DUKE of BURGUNDY ¹⁹⁷

KING HENRY V

Peace to this meeting, wherefore we are met!
Unto our brother France, and to our sister,
Health and fair time of day; joy and good wishes
To our most fair and princely cousin Katharine;
And, as a branch and member of this royalty,
By whom this great assembly is contrived,
We do salute you, Duke of Burgundy.

KING OF FRANCE

Right joyous are we to behold your face,
Most worthy brother England; fairly met:
So are you, princes English, every one.

QUEEN ISABEL

So happy be the issue, brother England,
Of this good day and of this gracious meeting,
As we are now glad to behold your eyes;
Your eyes, which hitherto have borne in them
Against the French, that met them in their bent,
The fatal balls of murdering basilisks:
The venom of such looks, we fairly hope,
Have lost their quality, and that this day
Shall change all griefs and quarrels into love.

KING HENRY V

To cry amen to that, thus we appear.

QUEEN ISABEL

You English princes all, I do salute you.

BURGUNDY

My duty to you both, on equal love,
Great Kings of France and England! That I have labour'd,
With all my wits, my pains and strong endeavours,
To bring your most imperial majesties
Unto this bar and royal interview,
Your mightiness on both parts best can witness.
Since then my office hath so far prevail'd
That, face to face and royal eye to eye,
You have congreeted, let it not disgrace me,
If I demand, before this royal view,
What rub or what impediment there is,

¹⁹⁷ It is important that the Duke of Burgundy be portrayed as a young man. Historically, this Duke of Burgundy was thrust into his role when his father, John the Fearless, was assassinated by the Armagnac faction in September of 1419.

Why that the naked, poor and mangled Peace,
Should not in this best garden of the world
Our fertile France, put up her lovely visage?
And as our vineyards, fallows, meads and hedges,
Defective in their natures, grow to wildness,
Even so our houses and ourselves and children
Have lost, or do not learn for want of time,
The sciences that should become our country;
But grow like savages,--as soldiers will
That nothing do but meditate on blood,--
To swearing and stern looks, diffused attire
And every thing that seems unnatural.
Which to reduce into our former favour
You are assembled: and my speech entreats
That I may know the let, why gentle Peace
Should not expel these inconveniences
And bless us with her former qualities.

KING HENRY V

If, Duke of Burgundy, you would the peace,
Whose want gives growth to the imperfections
Which you have cited, you must buy that peace
With full accord to all our just demands.

BURGUNDY

The king hath heard them; to the which as yet
There is no answer made.

KING HENRY V

Well then, the peace,
Which you before so urged, lies in his answer.

KING OF FRANCE

I have but with a cursory eye
O'erglanced the articles: pleaseth your grace
To appoint some of your council presently
To sit with us once more, with better heed
To re-survey them, we will suddenly
Pass our accept and peremptory answer.

KING HENRY V

Brother, we shall. Go with the king, brother,
And take with you free power to ratify,
Augment, or alter, as your wisdoms best
Shall see advantageable for our dignity,
Anything in or out of our demands,
And we'll consign thereto. Will you, fair sister,
Go with the princes, or stay here with us?

QUEEN ISABEL

Our gracious brother, I will go with them:
Haply a woman's voice may do some good,
When articles too nicely urged be stood on.

KING HENRY V

Yet leave our cousin Katharine here with us:
She is our capital demand, comprised
Within the fore-rank of our articles.

QUEEN ISABEL

She hath good leave.

Exeunt all except KING HENRY, KATHARINE, and ALICE

KING HENRY V

Fair Katharine, and most fair,
Will you vouchsafe to teach a soldier terms
Such as will enter at a lady's ear
And plead his love-suit to her gentle heart?

KATHARINE

Your majesty shall mock at me; I cannot speak your England.

KING HENRY V

O. Fair Katharine, if you will love me soundly with
your French heart, I will be glad to hear you
confess it brokenly with your English tongue. Do
you like me, Kate?

KATHARINE

Pardonnez-moi, I cannot tell vat is 'like me.'

KING HENRY V

An angel is like you, Kate, and you are like an angel.

KATHARINE

Que dit-il? que je suis semblable a les anges?

ALICE

Oui, vraiment, sauf votre grace, ainsi dit-il.

KING HENRY V

I said so, dear Katharine; and I must not blush to
affirm it.

KATHARINE

O bon Dieu! les langues des hommes sont pleines de
tromperies.

KING HENRY V

What says she, fair one? that the tongues of men
are full of deceits?

ALICE

Oui, dat de tongues of de mans is be full of
deceits: dat is de princess.

KING HENRY V

The princess is the better Englishwoman. I' faith,
Kate, my wooing is fit for thy understanding: I am
glad thou canst speak no better English; for, if
thou couldst, thou wouldst find me such a plain king
that thou wouldst think I had sold my farm to buy my
crown. I know no ways to mince it in love, but
directly to say 'I love you:' then if you urge me
farther than to say 'do you in faith?' I wear out
my suit. Give me your answer; i' faith, do: and so
clap hands and a bargain: how say you, lady?

KATHARINE

Sauf votre honneur, me understand vell.

KING HENRY V

Marry, if you would put me to verses or to dance for
your sake, Kate, why you undid me: for the one, I
have neither words nor measure, and for the other, I
have no strength in measure, yet a reasonable
measure in strength. If I could win a lady at
leap-frog, or by vaulting into my saddle with my
armour on my back, I should quickly leap into a wife.
But, before God, Kate, I cannot look greenly nor gasp out my
eloquence, nor I have no cunning in protestation;
only downright oaths, which I never use till urged,
nor never break for urging. If thou canst love a
fellow of this temper, Kate, whose face is not worth
sun-burning, that never looks in his glass for love
of any thing he sees there, let thine eye be thy
cook. I speak to thee plain soldier. And while thou
livest, dear Kate, take a fellow of plain and
uncoined constancy; for these fellows of infinite tongue, that
can rhyme themselves into ladies' favours, they do
always reason themselves out again. A
good leg will fall; a straight back will stoop; a
black beard will turn white; a curled pate will grow
bald; a fair face will wither; a full eye will wax
hollow: but a good heart, Kate, is the sun and the
moon; or, rather, the sun, and not the moon; for it
shines bright and never changes, but keeps his
course truly. If thou would have such a one, take
me; and take me, take a soldier; take a soldier,
take a king. And what sayest thou then to my love?
speak, my fair, and fairly, I pray thee.

KATHARINE

Is it possible dat I sould love de enemy of France?

KING HENRY V

No; it is not possible you should love the enemy of France, Kate: but, in loving me, you should love the friend of France; for I love France so well that I will not part with a village of it; I will have it all mine: and, Kate, when France is mine and I am yours, then yours is France and you are mine.

KATHARINE

I cannot tell vat is dat.

KING HENRY V

No, Kate? I will tell thee in French; which I am sure will hang upon my tongue like a new-married wife about her husband's neck, hardly to be shook off.

Je quand sur le possession de France, et quand vous avez le possession de moi, --let me see, what then? Saint Denis be my speed! --donc votre est France et vous etes mienne.

It is as easy for me, Kate, to conquer the kingdom as to speak so much more French: I shall never move thee in French, unless it be to laugh at me.

KATHARINE

Sauf votre honneur, le Francois que vous parlez, il est meilleur que l'Anglois le quel je parle.

KING HENRY V

No, faith, is't not, Kate. But, Kate, dost thou understand thus much English, canst thou love me?

KATHARINE

I cannot tell.

KING HENRY V

Can any of your neighbours tell, Kate? I'll ask them. Come, I know thou lovest me: and at night, when you come into your closet, you'll question this gentlewoman about me; and I know, Kate, you will to her dispraise those parts in me that you love with your heart: but, good Kate, mock me mercifully; the rather, gentle princess, because I love thee cruelly. Shall not thou and I, between Saint Denis and Saint George, compound a boy, half French, half English, that shall go to Constantinople and take the Turk by the beard? Shall we not? What sayest thou, my fair flower-de-luce?

How answer you, *la plus belle Katharine du monde,*
mon tres cher et devin deesse?

KATHARINE

Your majestee ave fausse French enough to deceive de
most sage demoiselle dat is en France.

KING HENRY V

Now, fie upon my false French! By mine honour, in
true English, I love thee, Kate: by which honour I
dare not swear thou love'st me; yet my blood begins to
flatter me that thou dost, notwithstanding the poor
and untempering effect of my visage. But, in faith,
Kate, the elder I wax, the better I shall appear:
my comfort is, that old age, that ill layer up of
beauty, can do no more spoil upon my face: thou
hast me, if thou hast me, at the worst; and thou
shalt wear me, if thou wear me, better and better.
And therefore tell me, most fair Katharine, will you
have me?
Come, your answer in broken music; for thy voice is
music and thy English broken; therefore, Katharine,
break thy mind to me in broken English; wilt thou have me?

KATHARINE

Dat is as it sall please de roi mon pere.

KING HENRY V

Nay, it will please him well, Kate it shall please
him, Kate.

KATHARINE

Den it sall also content me.

KING HENRY V

Upon that I kiss your hand, and I call you my queen.

KATHARINE

Laissez, mon seigneur, laissez, laissez: ma foi, je
ne veux point que vous abaissiez votre grandeur en
baisant la main d'une de votre seigneurie indigne
serviteur; excusez-moi, je vous supplie, mon
tres-puissant seigneur.

KING HENRY V

Then I will kiss your lips, Kate.

KATHARINE

Les dames et demoiselles pour etre baisees devant
leur noces, il n'est pas la coutume de France.

KING HENRY V

Madam my interpreter, what says she?

ALICE

Dat it is not be de fashion pour les ladies of
France, --I cannot tell vat is baiser en Anglish.

KING HENRY V

To kiss.

ALICE

Your majesty entendre better que moi.

KING HENRY V

It is not a fashion for the maids in France to kiss
before they are married, would she say?

ALICE

Oui, vraiment.

KING HENRY V

O Kate, nice customs curtsy to great kings. Dear
Kate, you and I cannot be confined within the weak
list of a country's fashion: we are the makers of
manners, Kate; therefore, patiently and yielding -

KATHARINE takes the initiative and kisses HENRY

You have witchcraft in your lips, Kate: there is
more eloquence in a sugar touch of them than in the
tongues of the French council. Here comes your father.

Re-enter the FRENCH KING and QUEEN, BURGUNDY, and the English Lords

BURGUNDY

God save your majesty! my royal cousin, teach you
our princess English?

KING HENRY V

I would have her learn, my fair cousin, how
perfectly I love her; and that is good English.¹⁹⁸
Shall Kate be my wife?

FRENCH KING

So please you.

We have consented to all terms of reason.

KING HENRY V

Is't so, my lords of England?

GLOUCESTER

¹⁹⁸ There is a good deal more between Henry and Burgundy talking about Kate, but it brings the narrative to a halt and does not move the plot forward at a time when we are nearly at its end.

The king hath granted every article:
His daughter first, and then in sequel all,
According to their firm proposed natures.

KING HENRY V

I pray you then, in love and dear alliance,
With that your blessing, to give me your daughter.

FRENCH KING

Take her, fair son, and from her blood raise up
Issue to me; that the contending kingdoms
Of France and England, whose very shores look pale
With envy of each other's happiness,
May cease their hatred, and this dear conjunction
Plant neighbourhood and Christian-like accord
In their sweet bosoms, that never war advance
His bleeding sword 'twixt England and fair France.

ALL

Amen!

KING HENRY V

Now, welcome, Kate: and bear me witness all,
That here I kiss her as my sovereign queen.

Kisses her

QUEEN ISABEL

God, the best maker of all marriages,
Combine your hearts in one, your realms in one!
As man and wife, being two, are one in love,
So be there 'twixt your kingdoms such a spousal,
That never may ill office, or fell jealousy,
Which troubles oft the bed of blessed marriage,
Thrust in between the paction of these kingdoms,
To make divorce of their incorporate league;
That English may as French, French Englishmen,
Receive each other. God speak this Amen!

ALL

Amen!

KING HENRY V

Prepare we for our marriage--on which day,
My Lord of Burgundy, we'll take your oath,
And all the peers', for surety of our leagues.
Then shall I swear to Kate, and you to me;
And may our oaths well kept and prosperous be!

Lights shift to the CHORUS.

CHORUS¹⁹⁹

Thus far, with rough and all-unable pen,
Your bending author hath pursued the story,
In little room confining mighty men,
Mangling by starts the full course of their glory.
Small time, but in that small most greatly lived
This star of England: Fortune made his sword;
By which the world's best garden be achieved.
King Henry the Fifth, too famous to live long:
England ne'er lost a king of so much worth.²⁰⁰

The CHORUS places the journal in the hands of the CHAPLAIN

Henry the Sixth, in infant bands crown'd King
Of France and England, did this king succeed;
Whose state so many had the managing,
That they lost France and made his England bleed.

Projection of the text: FIN

Curtain Call

¹⁹⁹ The final Chorus speech is in fact a sonnet, but since the final couplet refers to previous staging of the *Henry VI* plays, I removed it and inserted two lines from the opening scene of *Henry VI Part 1*.

²⁰⁰ These are the two lines from *Henry VI Part 1*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources:

- Dekker, Thomas. *The Shoemaker's Holiday*, edited by Jonathan Gil Harris. London: Methuen Drama, 2008.
- Drayton, Michael, et al. "Sir John Oldcastle Part 1." In *The Oldcastle controversy*, edited by Peter Corbin and Douglas Sedge. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1991.
- "Famous Victories of Henry V." In *The Oldcastle controversy*, edited by Peter Corbin and Douglas Sedge. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1991.
- Hall, Edward. *Hall's Chronicle*. New York: AMS Press Inc., 1965.
- Hall, Edward. *The Union of the two noble families of Lancaster and York, 1550*. Menston: Scolar Press, 1970.
- Hanabusa, Chiaki, ed. *The Famous Victories of Henry the Fifth (1598)*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007.
- Holinshed, Raphael. *Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland. Vol 3*. London: Printed for J. Johnson, 1807-08.
- Preest, David and James G. Clark, ed. *The Chronica Maiora of Thomas Walsingham*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2005.
- Shakespeare, William. *King Richard II*, edited by Charles R. Forker. London: The Arden Shakespeare, 2002.
- Shakespeare, William. *King Henry IV Part 1*, edited by David Scott Kastan. London: The Arden Shakespeare, 2002.
- Shakespeare, William. *King Henry IV Part 1*, edited by David Bevington. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- Shakespeare, William. *King Henry IV Part 2*, edited by A.R. Humphreys. London: The Arden Shakespeare, 1981.
- Shakespeare, William. *King Henry IV Part 2*, edited by Rene Weis. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Shakespeare, William. *King Henry V*, edited by T.W. Craik. London: The Arden Shakespeare, 1995.
- Shakespeare, William. *King Henry V*, edited by Gary Taylor. New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- Taylor, Frank and John S. Roskell, ed. *Gesta Henrici Quinti (The Deeds of Henry the Fifth)*. London: Oxford University Press, 1975.

Secondary Sources – Books:

- Allmand, Christopher. *Henry V*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: The University of California Press,

- 1992.
- Asimov, Isaac. *Guide to Shakespeare*. New York: Gramercy, 1970.
- Barker, Juliet. *Agincourt: Henry V and the battle that made England*. New York: Back Bay Books, 2005.
- Bloom, Harold. *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human*. New York: Riverhead Books, 1998.
- Campbell, Lily B. *Shakespeare's "Histories": Mirrors of Elizabethan Policy*. San Marino: Huntington Library, 1947.
- Chernaik, Warren. *The Cambridge Introduction to Shakespeare's History Plays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Corbin, Peter, and Douglas Sedge, ed. *The Oldcastle controversy*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1991.
- Curry, Anne. *Agincourt: A New History*. Stroud: Tempus, 2005.
- Curry, Anne and Malcolm Mercer, ed. *The Battle of Agincourt*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2015.
- Curry, Anne. *Henry V: Playboy Prince to Warrior King (Penguin Monarchs)*. London: Allen Lane, 2015.
- Dockray, Keith. *Henry V*. Stroud: Tempus, 2004.
- Dodd, Gwilym, ed. *Henry V: New Interpretations*. Woodbridge: York Medieval Press, 2013.
- Dollimore, Jonathan, and Alan Sinfield, ed. *Political Shakespeare*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985.
- Downer, Alan S. *The Eminent Tragedian William Charles Macready*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966.
- Foakes, R.A. and R.T. Rickert, ed. *Henslowe's Diary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961.
- Frye, Northrop. *Northrop Frye on Shakespeare*. Markham: Fitzhenry & Whiteside, 1986.
- Garber, Marjorie. *Shakespeare After All*. New York: Anchor Books, 2004.
- Goddard, Harold. *The Meaning of Shakespeare: Volume 1*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951.
- Granville-Barker, Harley. *More Prefaces to Shakespeare*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. *Shakespearean Negotiations: The Circulation of Social Energy in Renaissance England*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- Hammer, Paul E.J. *The Polarisation of Elizabethan Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Harbage, Alfred, ed. *William Shakespeare: The Complete Works*. New York: Viking Penguin, 1969.
- Hattaway, Michael, et al. *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare's History Plays*.

- Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Holderness, Graham. *Shakespeare's History*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1985.
- Holderness, Graham, ed. *Shakespeare's History Plays: Richard II to Henry V*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992.
- Holderness, Graham. *Shakespeare: The Histories*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000.
- Jacob, E.F. *Henry V and the Invasion of France*. London: The English Universities Press, 1947.
- Karremann, Isabel. *The Drama of Memory in Shakespeare's History Plays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Kean, Charles. *King Henry the Fifth* (adapted 1859). London: Cornmarket Press, 1971.
- Kemble, John Philip. *Henry V* (adapted 1789). London: Cornmarket Press, 1971.
- Knowles, Ronald. *Shakespeare's Argument with History*. New York: Palgrave, 2002.
- McCarthy, Dennis and June Schlueter. "A Brief Discourse of Rebellion and Rebels" by George North: A Newly Uncovered Manuscript Source for Shakespeare's Plays. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer. 2018.
- Montrose, Louis A. *The Purpose of Playing*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.
- Mortimer, Ian. *The Fears of Henry IV: England's Self-made King*. London: Jonathan Cape, 2007.
- Nicoll, Allardyce and Josephine Nicoll, ed. *Holinshed's Chronicle: As Used in Shakespeare's Plays*. London: J.M. Dent and Sons, 1927.
- Pearlman, Elihu. *William Shakespeare: The History Plays*. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1992.
- Pitcher, Seymour M. *The Case for Shakespeare's Authorship of The Famous Victories*. New York: State University of New York, 1961.
- Pugliatti, Paola. *Shakespeare the Historian*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996.
- Rackin, Phyllis. *Stages of History*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990.
- Saccio, Peter. *Shakespeare's English Kings: History, Chronicle, and Drama (second edition)*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Shapiro, James. *A Year in the Life of William Shakespeare (1599)*. New York: Harper Collins, 2005.
- Shattuck, Charles H., ed. *John Philip Kemble Promptbooks*. Charlottesville: Published for the Folger Shakespeare Library by the University Press of Virginia, 1974.
- Smith, Emma, ed. *Shakespeare's Histories*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2004.
- Spanabel, Robert R. *A Stage History of Henry the Fifth: 1583-1859*. PhD diss., The Ohio State University, 1969.
- Tanner, Tony. *Prefaces to Shakespeare*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2010.
- Tillyard, E.M.W. *Shakespeare's History Plays*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1944.

- Tosh, Will. *Male Friendship and Testimonies of Love in Shakespeare's England*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.
- Trewin, J.C. *Mr. Macready: A Nineteenth-Century Tragedian and His Theatre*. London: Harrap, 1955.
- Vale, Malcolm. *Henry V: The Conscience of a King*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2016.
- Watt, R.J.C., ed. *Shakespeare's History Plays*. London and New York: Longman, 2002.
- Wilders, John. *The Lost Garden: A View of Shakespeare's English and Roman History Plays*. Totowa: Rowman and Littlefield, 1978.
- Wilson, J. Dover. *The Fortunes of Falstaff*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1943.

Secondary Sources - Articles:

- Beck, J.L., et al. "Delineating a Spectrum of Research-Based Theatre." *Qualitative Inquiry* 17, no. 8, (October 2011): 687-700.
- Foulkes, Richard. "Charles Calvert's *Henry V*." *Shakespeare Survey* 41. (1988): 23-34.
- Jimenez, Ramon. "The Famous Victories of Henry the Fifth--Key to the Authorship Question?" *Shakespeare Oxford Newsletter* 37, no. 2 (Summer 2001): 7.
- Kingsford, C.L. "Reviews of Books." *The English Historical Review* 30, no. 117 (January 1915): 138-40.
- McCreadie, Marsha. "*Henry V*: Onstage and On Film." *Literature/Film Quarterly* 5, no. 4 (October 1977): 315-21.
- Medaille, Ann. "Creativity and Craft: The Information Seeking Behavior of Theatre Artists." *Journal of Documentation* 66, no. 3 (April 2010): 327-47.
- Rabkin, Norman. "Rabbits, Ducks, and *Henry V*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 28, no. 3 (Summer 1977): 279-96.
- Taylor, Gary. "Shakespeare and Others: The Authorship of *Henry the Sixth, Part One*." *Medieval & Renaissance Drama in England* 7. (January 1995): 145-205.
- Taylor, Miles. "The End of the English History Play in *Perkin Warbeck*." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* (Spring 2008): 395-418.
- Tran, Diep. "The Top 10 Most-Produced Plays of the 2015-16 Season." *American Theatre* 32, no. 8 (October 2015): 40-1.

Film and Television

- An Age of Kings*. Television series. Directed by Michael Hayes. UK: BBC Television, 1960; BBC Home Entertainment, March 31, 2009. DVD, 947 min.

Chimes at Midnight. Film. Directed by Orson Welles. Spain: Internacional Films, 1965; Criterion, August 30, 2016. Blu-ray Disc, 119 min.

Henry V. Film. Directed by Laurence Olivier. UK: Two Cities Films, 1944; Criterion, March 23, 1999. DVD, 136 min.

Henry V. Film. Directed by Kenneth Branagh. UK: BBC Films/Renaissance Films, 1989; MGM, July 18, 2000. DVD, 138 min.

Henry V: Shakespeare's Globe Theatre on Screen. Filmed Stage production. Directed by Dominic Dromgoole. UK: Shakespeare's Globe, 2012; Kultur, April 28, 2015. DVD, 164 min.

The Hollow Crown: Henry V. Television Film. Directed by Thea Sharrock. UK: BBC Two, 2012; Universal Studios Home Entertainment, April 1, 2014. DVD, 139 min.

King & Country. Filmed Stage productions. Directed by Gregory Doran. UK: Royal Shakespeare Company, 2015; BBC/Opus Arte, April 29, 2016. DVD, 663 min.

My Own Private Idaho. Film. Directed by Gus Van Sant. US: Fine Line Features, 1991; Criterion, March 1, 2005. DVD, 104 min.